

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

---

VOL. XV, I.

WHOLE No. 57.

---

## I.—THE DRAMATIC SATURA AND THE OLD COMEDY AT ROME.

It has long been observed that many of the events reported by Roman historians are so closely paralleled by fact and fable from Greek history and poetry as to preclude the possibility of belief in them as independent events, and to make the assumption of their derivation from Greek sources inevitable. Isolated observations of this fact were made by the ancients themselves; as, for example, when Gellius, after narrating (IV 5) the story of the perfidy of the Etruscan soothsayers in the matter of the statue of Horatius Cocles, gives the verse which was said to have been composed upon this occasion (*malum consilium consultori pessimum est*), and adds: *videtur autem versus hic de Graeco illo Hesiodi versu expressus*, ἡ δὲ κακὴ βουλή τῷ βουλευσάντι κακίστη,—or when Dionysius, in narrating the story of the capture of Gabii and the communication of plans between the elder Tarquin and his son Sextus by the episode of the staff and the poppyheads, concludes thus: ταῦτα ποιήσας ἀπέλυσε τὸν ἄγγελον, οὐδὲν ἀποκρινάμενος πολλάκις ἐπερωτῶντι, τὴν Θρασυβούλου τοῦ Μιλησίου διάνοιαν, ὡς ἔμοιγε δοκεῖ, μμησάμενος.<sup>1</sup> In modern times, while instances of this parallelism have been noted since the revival of classical studies, it required the revelation of the character of early Roman history to set scholars fairly upon the track of them, and accordingly we find that the relation of such statements to their source has, for the most part, been pointed out only since the time of Niebuhr.

<sup>1</sup> Dionysius, IV 56. Cf. Zonaras, VII 10: Ὁμοιον δὲ τι τούτῳ καὶ ὁ Ἡρόδοτος ἱστορεῖ, Herodotus, V 92, 6.

While it is doubtless true that the most flagrant violations of historical truth produced in this way belong to the period of Roman history for which the Romans themselves had no authentic records, the examples are by no means confined to it. For to the rhetorical historians of antiquity, to whom *concessum est ementiri in historiis ut aliquid dicere possint argutius*,<sup>1</sup> the requirement of embellishments for facts sufficiently well known would appeal with a force quite as great as the need of events to fill out periods of history for which there were no records. We find therefore, for instance, in Livy's account of the Second Punic War many descriptions which betray the influence of Greek writers, who have not only contributed picturesque details and adornments of one sort and another to similar events, but even—though much less often—the events themselves. Examples of the former class are the descriptions of the fall of Saguntum,<sup>2</sup> of the plague at Syracuse,<sup>3</sup> of the battle of Cirta.<sup>4</sup> Of the latter class is, probably, the story of Scipio's acquisition of three hundred volunteers from the young men of Sicily in a manner so similar to the device of Agesilaus at Ephesus for reinforcing his expedition to Asia, as to cast serious doubt upon the historical truth of Livy's narrative.<sup>5</sup>

The credit of bringing together the widely scattered observations of this character in the field of historical prose, and of considering them, not as individual and isolated instances, but as the manifestation of a phase of Rome's literary development, belongs to Eduard Zarncke.<sup>6</sup> The time at which most of these imitations of Greek history crept into Roman literature is

<sup>1</sup> Cicero, Brutus 42. Cf. also 43, where, after stating that the rhetorical writers of history chose the tradition that Themistocles had taken his own life, instead of the better-attested statement of Thucydides that he died a natural death, Atticus adds: *hanc enim mortem rhetorice et tragice ornare potuerunt, illa mors vulgaris nullam praebebat materiem ad ornandum.*

<sup>2</sup> Livy, XXI 8, 5. Manifestly influenced by a description of the capture of Halicarnassus by Alexander, which Arrian follows.

<sup>3</sup> Livy, XXV 26; Thucyd. II 51. This and the preceding example are cited by Zarncke (see *infra*, note 6), pp. 42 and 40.

<sup>4</sup> Livy, XXX 11 and 12. Corresponding to the battle of Cunaxa, as the expedition of Masinissa to Numidia was not unlike that of Cyrus against his brother. Observed and elucidated by Zieliński, *Die letzten Jahre des zweiten punischen Krieges*, p. 150 (Leipzig, 1880).

<sup>5</sup> Livy, XXIX 1. Cf. Zieliński, l. l., p. 121.

<sup>6</sup> *Der Einfluss der griechischen Litteratur auf die Entwicklung der römischen Prosa*, in *Commentationes philologiae quibus Ottoni Ribbeckio congratulantur discipuli Lipsienses*, pp. 269–325, Leipzig, 1888.

defined with approximate accuracy by him as the latter half of the second century B. C., the period in which the principal writers appeared who served as sources for the historians whose works are preserved; a period too which represents the first considerable efforts of the Romans in artistic and rhetorical prose. Indeed, in this fact lies the explanation of these resemblances; for where the only models of rhetorical prose which existed were Greek, it was inevitable that, along with stylistic adornments, not only descriptions and illustrations, but even events should be transferred.

In the field of literary history the same explanation of the transference of the facts of literary development from Greece to Rome would be, of course, inadequate, but whatever the true cause may have been<sup>1</sup> (and the number of instances which have as yet been recognized is perhaps too small to make a generalization possible), here also we find a parallelism, which resulted sometimes in the assumption of misleading analogies, and sometimes in the introduction into the history of Roman literature of forms which never had any real existence at Rome and which served only to fill out a parallel. An instance of the latter kind it is my purpose to discuss here.

The review of the beginnings of the Roman drama which Livy presents in the second chapter of his seventh book has attracted an amount of scholarly attention commensurate with its importance, but with results by no means worthy of the efforts bestowed upon it. It is not my purpose to review the history of the fruitless interpretations and hypotheses to which this passage has given rise, since most of them have been made without questioning the historical faithfulness of the account, and all of them in ignorance of the fact, observed by F. Leo,<sup>2</sup> that we have not in this review the genuine data either of history or tradition, but a series of statements derived for the most part from Aristotle's account of the development of Attic comedy. Before Leo, O. Jahn<sup>3</sup> had pointed out that this account displays a sharpness of division into periods attributable rather to philological combination than to the authentic record of facts, and he at the same time called attention to its aetiological character.<sup>4</sup> Kiessling also, while apparently

<sup>1</sup> An explanation of the case in question is suggested on p. 20. Cf. also p. 29.

<sup>2</sup> Varro und die Satire, *Hermes*, 24 (1889), p. 76 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *Hermes*, 2 (1867), p. 225.

<sup>4</sup> The explanation of the peculiar form of the Roman *canticum* and of the privileged position of the *actores Atellanarum*.

attaching considerable importance to the description as a whole,<sup>1</sup> had expressed doubt as to the existence of a prehistoric dramatic *satura* as set forth by Livy, and had maintained that it was in all probability merely an effort to parallel the satyr-drama of the Greeks by a Roman analogy.<sup>2</sup> These suspicions of the untrustworthiness of the narrative of Livy received a confirmation as striking as it was unsuspected in the observation of Leo above mentioned.

The following attempt to throw further light upon the relation of Livy's account to Aristotle, as well as to the similar description of Horace (Epp. II 1, 145-60), accepts as its starting-point the brilliant results of Leo's investigations.<sup>3</sup> It will be my effort to show that a parallelism exists between Aristotle and Livy much closer and more extensive than Leo seems to have suspected; as a result of which it will appear, I believe, that the much-vexed *saturae* of Livy, the *satura* of Euanthius' treatise *de comoedia* and the *satura* of Naevius are but the Roman designation of an analogue to the old Attic comedy, and that thus all evidence for the existence of any branch of literature bearing the name *satura* before the time of Ennius disappears. I shall further endeavor to point out some analogies between the accounts of Livy and Horace which have apparently escaped observation, and also certain points of contact between Horace and Aristotle.

The occasion of Livy's review, it will be remembered, is the mention of the first *ludi scaenici*, which were introduced from Etruria and undertaken, *inter alia caelestis irae placamina*, in the hope of obtaining relief from the violence of a plague, with which the city had been visited for two years (365 and 364 B. C.): *Ceterum parva quoque, ut ferme principia omnia, et ea ipsa peregrina res fuit. sine carmine ullo, sine imitandorum carminum actu, ludiones, ex Etruria acciti, ad tibicinis modos saliantes, haud indecoros motus more Tusco dabant.*<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ad Hor. Epp. II 1, 139.

<sup>2</sup> Q. Horatius Flaccus Satiren, Einl., p. vii. Following Jahn, B. Grubel (de Satirae Romanae origine et progressu, Prog., Posen, 1883), pp. 3 and 4, had also rejected Livy's account and held that the history of satire begins with Ennius (p. 6).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. also Zarncke in Bursian-Müller's Jahresbericht, 73, p. 324, and Schanz, Röm. Lit., p. 88.

<sup>4</sup> The separation of dance and music from words seems to have been made, without reference to the natural or probable development (see Schanz, Röm. Lit. I, p. 14), for the sake of giving the Etrurians a distinct place in the

(5) *imitari deinde eos iuventus simul inconditis inter se iocularia fundentes versibus coepere, nec absoni a voce motus erant.*

(6) *accepta ilaque res saepiusque usurpando excitata.*

*vernaculis artificibus, quia ister Tusco verbo ludio vocabatur, nomen histrionibus inditum; (7) qui non, sicut ante, Fescennino versu similem inconpositum temere ac rudem alternis iaciebant,<sup>1</sup> sed inpletas modis saturas descripto iam ad tibicinem cantu motuque congruenti peragebant.*

(8) *Livius post aliquot annis, qui ab saturis ausus est primus argumento fabulam serere, idem scilicet, id quod omnes tum erant, suorum carminum actor, dicitur, (9) cum saepius revocatus vocem obtudisset, venia petita puerum ad canendum ante tibicinem cum statuisset, canticum egisse aliquanto magis vigente motu, quia nihil vocis usus inpediebat. (10) Inde ad manum cantari histrionibus coeptum, diverbiaque tantum ipsorum voci relicta. (11) postquam lege hac fabularum ab risu ac soluto ioco<sup>2</sup> res avocabatur et ludus in artem paulatim verterat,*

*iuventus histrionibus fabellarum actu relicto ipsa inter se more antiquo ridicula intexta versibus iactitare coepit; quae exodia postea appellata consertaque fabellis potissimum Atellanis sunt.*

In Livy as in Horace, the beginnings of the drama are connected with the *Fescennina licentia*.<sup>3</sup>

history of the Roman stage. That the tradition which assigned them such a place may have had elements of truth in it is possible, though it seems highly probable that aetiology was at work here also, in the effort to explain the word *histrion*, quia ister *Tusco* verbo ludio vocabatur (Livy, l. i., 6).

<sup>1</sup> It is perhaps superfluous to say that the words *qui non . . . iaciebant* belong to the characterization of the *iocularia* of the preceding paragraph, as is shown by *sicut ante*.

<sup>2</sup> These words are practically the only characterization of the *saturae* of the preceding paragraph which the description of Livy affords, as Bernhardt pointed out (Röm. Lit., p. 394, An. 275). The phrase is parallel to *ab saturis* above. The development into a more artistic dramatic form is incorrectly attributed, however, solely (*lege hac*) to the external modifications introduced by Livius, while, in fact, the internal changes first introduced by him (*argumento fabulam serere*) must have been the real causes of development *ab risu ac soluto ioco*.

<sup>3</sup> Horace, Epp. II i, 145, and Livy, l. i., 7, *Fescennino versu similem*, where see note 1. The derivation from *fascinus* (= φαλλός), which makes the *Fescennini* entirely parallel to the Greek φαλλικά, seems to be the prevailing explanation of the word, in spite of the energetic opposition of Teuffel-Schwabe (I, p. 4), who lay special stress upon the support which the analogy of the *Atellanae* (from *Atella*) gives to the derivation from the name of the

The crude beginnings thus made were developed by degrees until the dramatic performances passed into the hands of professional actors, who produced so-called satires. These much-discussed *saturae*, which have been awarded the dignity of classification as a separate and original form of Roman satire,<sup>1</sup> receive more light perhaps from Leo's discovery than any other portion of this account; but, while he has given us the material for a correct interpretation, Leo has not, I believe, discerned the true reason for the presence of *saturae* in this description. He says (l. 1., p. 77): "Aus einer so offenbar construirten Darstellung ist kein Moment als historische Thatsache anzunehmen; der Litterarhistoriker hat augenscheinlich nur nach einen Ausdruck gesucht, der eine noch in freier Form sich bewegende Dichtungsart<sup>2</sup> schicklich bezeichnen könnte: er fand den von Ennius aus der Sprache des Lebens (*per saturam*) eingeführten Titel bezeichnend. Möglich auch dass er, der Etymologie *satura*—σάτυροι folgend, den Namen nach dem Aristotelischen διὰ τὸ ἐκ σατυρικοῦ μεταβαλεῖν ὁψέ ἀπεσεμνύνθη (Poet. 1449a, 20) bildete; sicher das er im folgenden diese *satura* in Analogie zum Satyrspiel setzt. Jedesfalls muss die vorhistorische *satura* aus der Geschichte der römischen Poesie in ihre Quellenkunde versetzt werden."

Etrurian town *Fescennium*. Instead of confirming the derivation, the analogy seems to me rather to give a clew to its origin. When the connection between *fascinus* and *Fescennini* had perhaps become somewhat obscured, nothing would have been more natural, after the introduction of the *fabulae Atellanae*, whether for the people or the philologists of Rome, than to construct a parallel explanation of the *Fescennini* on the same pattern. That Etrurian names and customs were an inexhaustible source for the explanation of all that was obscure in Roman life and language would only facilitate this process. Cf. Porphyrio ad Hor. Epp. II 1, 145.

<sup>1</sup> So Nettleship, *The Roman Satira: its original form in connection with its literary development*, Oxford, 1878; the historians of Roman literature and many others incidentally. The ancient critics distinguished but two forms of satire, the Ennian and the Lucilian. Diomedes (Suetonius, Reif., p. 20), p. 485, and Quintilian, X 1, 93.

<sup>2</sup> In interpreting the word as a somewhat colorless designation of a free and formless poetical genus like the *saturae* of Ennius, Leo seems to have been anticipated by Düntzer, *Kritik d. Hor. IV*, p. 284, note 2: "Hätte Livius ausdrücken wollen, diesen älteren, ungeordneten Spielen habe man den Namen *saturae* beigelegt, so dürfte er nicht sagen: *non Fescennino etc. . . . peragebant*, wo *saturae* nicht in einem besondern, vielmehr ganz im gewöhnlichen Sinne genommen ist, für Mischgedichte, Quodlibet." But, of course, Düntzer does not question the existence of the stage of development described by this designation. Cf. also *id.*, vol. II, p. 6.

Of the two considerations here advanced by Leo in explanation of the designation *satura*, the first need not delay us now, since it will appear with sufficient clearness in the course of my discussion that a much more definite meaning and one more closely parallel to the Greek source is attached to the word. The second, however, which is identical with Kiessling's conjecture mentioned above, calls for a word of criticism before going further, since it can be shown, I am convinced, without reference to the true interpretation, that neither our source nor the narrative of Livy gives any support to the assumption of a relation between the *σάτυροι* and these *saturae*.

In the first place, if the compiler of this account was striving to represent an analogy to the Greek satyr-drama, it is hard to see why he should not have followed Greek sources relating to the *σατυρικόν*, instead of setting forth his parallel in words borrowed from the history of comedy. The latter case would only be conceivable if the words *διὰ τὸ ἐκ σατυρικοῦ μεταβαλεῖν* (to which Leo appeals) were said of comedy and not of tragedy. Certainly no good reason can be given why Aristotle's account was made use of, unless the *saturae* were meant to parallel some phase of the development of Greek comedy, and not the satyr-drama. The further reason for believing that the *saturae* here described correspond to the *σάτυροι* is, according to Leo, the fact that in the words of Livy immediately following they appear in an unmistakable analogy to the satyr-drama. Leo is by no means the first to assert the existence of such an analogy—it is one of the commonplaces of the interpretation of this passage, and he deems it therefore apparently unnecessary to point it out in detail. Briefly stated, this view depends upon the assumption of a transition of the *saturae* to *exodia*,<sup>1</sup> which, as the form and significance of their designation, as well as their relation to the *Atellanae*,<sup>2</sup> indicate, were afterpieces in the manner of the satyr-drama. Let us examine the words of Livy to see with what justice this assumption is made. It has been well observed by

<sup>1</sup> Teuffel-Schwabe, I, p. 6 (1): "Einigen Halt bietet . . . der Uebergang in den Begriff *exodia*"; Fritzsche, Horatius Serm. Einl., p. 14; Bernhardt, p. 395: "Das exodium war eine dramatisirte *satura*." See note 2, p. 9, for the history of this view.

<sup>2</sup> Livy, I. I., 11: *exodia . . . conserta fabellis potissimum Atellanis sunt*. Cf. also Lydus de mag. p. r. I 40: 'Ατελλάνη δέ ἐστιν τῶν λεγομένων ἐξοδιαρίων, and Diomedes (Suetonius, Reifferscheid, p. 14): *Atellanae, argumentis dictisque iocularibus similes satyricis fabulis Graecis*.

Jahn and others<sup>1</sup> that a sharp distinction is drawn between the performances of the Roman youth and the regular actors (*histriones*), but with a perversity of judgment in the face of clear statements which is quite incomprehensible, they have insisted that in this distinction the *satura* is assigned to the *iuventus*.<sup>2</sup> But if the distinction holds good once in this account (11) it should hold again, and it is very distinctly said (in 6) that the *saturae* (being no longer rude productions of Fescennine character like the earlier *iocularia* of the *iuventus*) were produced by *vernaculis artificibus* (*τεχνιταις*),<sup>3</sup> who were called *histriones*.<sup>4</sup> So far, then, as Livy's account informs us, with the development of *iocularia* into *saturae* the *iuventus* disappear<sup>5</sup> until the drama had finally begun to take on artistic form (*paulatim in artem verterat*), when the *iuventus* again, leaving to *histriones* the production of regular plays, began to produce ridiculous buffoonery by way of afterpieces to them, which were then called *exodia*. Now, as has been said, these *ridicula* (*exodia*) of the *iuventus* are commonly assumed to have been an outgrowth of and an advance upon the *saturae*. But the fact that these *saturae* were produced by *histriones*, as we have seen, would

<sup>1</sup> Jahn, l. l., p. 225; Mommsen, Röm. Gesch. II<sup>6</sup>, p. 438, note.

<sup>2</sup> Jahn, l. l.: "Der *iuventus* wird die formlose *satura* zugeeignet." Fritzsche (Hor. Einl., p. 12), apparently unable to free himself from this view and at the same time realizing that it is not contained in Livy's words, takes refuge in the absurd and entirely unwarranted statement that the *saturae* were first produced by regular actors and afterward by the *iuventus*!

<sup>3</sup> A. Müller, Die griechischen Bühnenalterthümer, p. 170, note 2 ad fin.: "Seit Philipp's Zeit tritt für *ὑποκριτής* die allgemeinere Bezeichnung *τεχνίτης* auf." The Lat. *artifex* is used in this sense absolutely in a good many places, e. g. Quint. XI 3, 73. Cf. also Gellius, XX 4.

<sup>4</sup> While Leo seems to share the common view of the relation of the *saturae* to the later *ridicula* (*exodia*) of the *iuventus*, he still has appreciated the fact that according to Livy the *saturae* are in the hands of professional actors and not of the *iuventus* (illustrating this point admirably from Aristotle). "Durch Uebung ward aus den Improvisationen eine Kunst, deren sich berufsmässige Künstler bemachtigten" (p. 77).

<sup>5</sup> A striking analogy to the disappearance of the *iuventus* at this point, and their reappearance when the *saturae* gave way to the more artistic comedy, is furnished by the history of the Attic drama. Cf. Wilamowitz, Herakles, vol. I, p. 55: "Aus den volkstümlichen tätzen geht die komödie hervor, und sobald sie da ist, verschwindet diese vorstufe." And in a note to these words: "Am bezeichnendsten ist dass die spiele der freiwilligen [*iuventus*] sofort wieder aufkamen, als der staat den vergeblichen versuch machte, die komödie zu unterdrücken . . . Kratinos erhielt keinen chor: da führte er seine Rinderhirten mit freiwilligen als einen dithyrambos auf" (v. Hesychius, s. v. *πυρπρεγγχει*).

alone be sufficient to call this assumption into question, even were we without positive evidence of the relation of the productions of the *iuventus* to the earlier period. Livy says (II) that the *iuventus* . . . *inter se* . . . *ridicula intexta versibus iactitare coepit*, and that they did this *antiquo more* ('in their old way'). Now, looking back over Livy's account we find that the only other mention of the *iuventus* (5) tells us that they imitated the pantomime of the Etrurian players, at the same time *inconditis inter se iocularia fundentes versibus*, a description as nearly identical with that of the later *ridicula (exodia)*, just quoted, as could well have been given without the repetition of the same words.<sup>1</sup> It appears, therefore, that the *exodia* are not a survival of the *saturae*, but rather of the rude, Fescennine-like productions which preceded them.<sup>2</sup> The history of the *saturae* after their abandonment by Livius Andronicus the account does not contain, but it does not imply that they absolutely ceased with Livius' innovation. Here they appear simply as a step in the development of the artistic drama, just as the *iocularia* of the *iuventus* were a step in their development. To conclude, therefore, this digressive criticism, it should be clear that neither our source (Aristotle) nor the plain interpretation of the text of Livy gives any support to the assumption of an analogy between the *saturae* and the satyr-drama.

<sup>1</sup> The same thing is described in similar phraseology in 6: (*histriones . . . qui non*) *sicut ante* (i. e. *sicut iuventus*) *Fescennino versu similem incompositum temere ac rudem alternis iaciebant*. The effort to give variety to the same description in these three places will scarcely escape the attentive reader, e. g. *fundentes* (5), *iaciebant* (7), *iactitare* (II); *inter se* (5), *alternis* (7), *inter se* (II); *iocularia* (5), *Fescennino versu sim.* (7), *ridicula* (II), etc.

<sup>2</sup> So far as I have been able to ascertain, Casaubon, in his famous dissertation *de satyrica Graecorum poesi et Romanorum satira* ed. Hal. 1776, p. 183, was the first to advance this view of the relation of the *exodia* to the *saturae* which I have been at pains to refute, and scholars since his time have followed him without much, if any, dissent. Yet Casaubon's only reason for the assumption of their relation is trivial, and based upon inaccurate observation. He says, after quoting Livy, VII 2, 11 (*ridicula intexta versibus* etc.), "appellatione *versuum*, satiram, cuius paullo ante meminerat, intellexisse hic Livium, nequit ambigi." But why the designation *versus* should require us to refer the *exodia* to the *saturae* is not at all clear. Probably he meant that the use of *versibus* in II indicated the more developed form of poetry which the *saturae* are represented to be, as if the earlier and cruder stage were not in metrical form. If that is so, he curiously overlooked the fact that *versibus* is also used in 5 of the form of the original *iocularia* of the *iuventus*, and, as I have shown, it is to this description that section II reverts.

Comedy, says Aristotle,<sup>1</sup> had its origin in improvised phallic verses. Its early development was obscure because it was not seriously cultivated, but was produced by volunteers, and only received public recognition and a chorus from the archon comparatively late. The most important phase of its development was the introduction of the general plot, *μῦθοι* (*argumentum*), and the abandonment of personal censure and invective (*ἡ ἱαμβικὴ ἰδέα*). Epicharmus and Phormis in Sicily had been the first to make this change, but of the Athenians Κράτης πρῶτος ἤρξεν ἀφένεος τῆς ἱαμβικῆς ἰδέας καθόλου ποιεῖν λόγους καὶ μύθους.<sup>2</sup> With this description of the work of Crates compare the words of Livy (8): *Livius . . . ab saturis ausus est primus argumento<sup>3</sup> fabulam serere*. That there is a relation here is obvious, and also that somehow or other the *saturae* are compared with the iambic ἰδέα—a phrase which describes the element of personal abuse (τὰ καθ' ἑκάστον<sup>4</sup>) which characterized the old comedy, in distinction from the *μῦθοι* or the *μῦθος διὰ τῶν εἰκότων*<sup>4</sup> of the new<sup>5</sup> comedy. *ἡ ἱαμβικὴ ἰδέα* serves, therefore, at once to designate and to characterize the old

<sup>1</sup> Poetics, 4, 1449a, 10 and 38 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Poetics, 5, 1449b, 7. Cited and compared with Livy by Leo, l. l., p. 78. It is surprising that Casaubon should have recognized the similarity of these two passages without suspecting a relation of dependence between them. That he had observed their resemblance is, I believe, sufficiently clear from the following (de sat. poesi, p. 181): "quemadmodum autem apud Graecos usurpationem τῆς ἱαμβικῆς ἰδέας, ut cum Philosopho loquamur, excepit in scena dramatice post inventam . . . ab Epicharmo et Cratete comoediam: sic satiram veterem secuta est fabularum compositio; quarum auctor primus apud Romanos Andronicus etc."

<sup>3</sup> *Argumento*, as a *terminus technicus*, may require a little elucidation. Cic. de Invent. I 19 (27): *argumentum est ficta res (μῦθος), quae tamen fieri potuit (διὰ τῶν εἰκότων, Poetics, 9, 1451b, 13, or καθόλου, as here; cf. ib., vs. 8: ἔστιν δὲ καθόλου μὲν, τῷ ποίῳ τὰ ποῖα ἅττα συμβαίνει λέγειν ἢ πράττειν: κατὰ τὸ εἶδος ἢ τὸ ἀναγκαῖον). huius modi apud Terentium etc.* Quintilian, II 4, 2: *argumentum, quod falsum sed vero simile comoediae fingunt*. Cf. also *id.* V 10, 9 and X 1, 100. *Argumentum* is therefore a very accurate rendering of καθόλου . . . μύθους. Concerning λόγους see Vahlen ad loc. The Greek technical equivalent of *argumentum* is πλάσμα, concerning which see p. 18, note 3. The passages cited would seem to indicate that *argumentum* was thus used chiefly of the new comedy.

<sup>4</sup> Poetics, 9, 1451b, 13 and 14.

<sup>5</sup> It need scarcely be remarked that Aristotle distinguishes but two kinds of comedy, the old and the new (καινὴ), the latter corresponding to the μέση and whatever of the νέα may have been known to him. This division is of course to be distinguished from the later twofold division of the Pergamene (?) critics. Cf. esp. Kaibel, Zur attischen Komödie, Hermes, 24, p. 59.

comedy, which Horace describes in the well-known lines at the beginning of the fourth satire of the first book, as follows:

*Eupolis atque Cratinus Aristophanesque poetae  
atque alii, quorum comoedia prisca virorum est,  
si quis erat dignus describi, quod malus ac fur,  
quod moechus foret aut sicarius aut alioqui  
famosus, multa cum libertate notabant.*<sup>1</sup>

For the same qualities of aggressive personal attack, Lucilius appears in a relation of dependence<sup>2</sup> upon the old comedy in the verses which follow:

*hinc omnis pendet Lucilius, hosce secutus  
mutatis tantum pedibus numerisque etc.*

If a relationship was thus recognized between Lucilius and the old comedy because of common characteristics, what would be more natural than that a descriptive designation of the old comedy (ἡ λαμβική ἰδέα) should be interpreted by the name of the compositions of Lucilius (*saturae*)? Our conclusion therefore is that the term *satura* in Livy's account owes its origin to a transference of the word, in the sharply defined meaning given to it by the peculiarly aggressive quality of the poems of Lucilius, to an assumed Roman parallel to the old Attic comedy, and that it was chosen as containing the most significant suggestion<sup>3</sup> of the qualities of the λαμβική ἰδέα.

<sup>1</sup> On the source of this description see Kiessling ad loc. and Platonius περὶ διαφορᾶς κωμ. (Dübner, I, vs. 7 ff.).

<sup>2</sup> Was Horace the first to affirm this relation, as Kiessling holds? Probably not. Leo has shown with great probability that it goes back certainly as far as Varro, while F. Marx (Stud. Lucil.) conjectured that the relation was suggested by Lucilius himself, and more recently (Interpretationum hexas I, Prog., Rostock, 1888, p. 12) he has brought to the support of his hypothesis certain unmistakable traces of Aristophanic verses in the fragments of Lucilius. Certainly the dramatic element in Lucilius was very pronounced (cf. L. Müller, Leben und Werke des G. L., p. 23), nor does he seem to have been without a consciousness of it. Cf. vs. 889 Lach. (adduced by Marx, Stud. Lucil., p. 43). In Müller's edition (XXX, vs. 16) the line, as emended by Dousa, has quite a different form and meaning.

<sup>3</sup> The comprehensive conception of ancient satire which recent criticism has rendered current, has done much to obscure the fact that the use of the word *satura*—and ancient comment upon this form of literature—is very much narrower than the literature of satire itself. Horace's description of Lucilius, his own remarks about himself (esp. Sat. II 1), and the later use of the word

This conclusion should require no further confirmation unless there be something in the description of the *saturae* in this passage which makes their identification with an assumed stage of dramatic development corresponding to the old comedy wholly inappropriate. I have already shown how the almost universal confusion of the *saturae* with the *exodia* has led to incorrect conceptions and characterizations<sup>1</sup> of the former, and it will not therefore be surprising if, at first thought, to most students of Roman literature the analogy between the *saturae* as here described and the ἀρχαία shall seem too faint for the establishment of any relationship between them. Let us see, then, how far it is possible to get at the character of the *saturae* from this description, without the aid of the meaning which I believe the word possesses here (for it will be seen, if this is correct, that the essential characterization of them lies in the designation itself). First, as commentators on Livy point out, the words *impletas modis* are emphatic, distinguishing the *saturae* from the irregular, Fescennine-like form which had preceded—an antithesis which is still further emphasized by *non sicut ante* in the preceding sentence, and also by the words which follow, *descripto iam* (marking the contrast) *ad tibicinem cantu etc.* Add to this the

or references to this literary genus convey, almost without exception, the idea of a literature of aggressive and personal attack. This was doubtless due very largely to the one-sided emphasis laid upon the polemical element in the satire of Lucilius, and is not only analogous, but probably also related to the similarly one-sided descriptions of Greek comedy by the character of the criticism presented in each period—the old (φαυερῶς), the middle (αἰνιγματωδῶς) and the new (ἢ μὴδ' ὁλως τοῦτο ποιῶσα πλὴν ἐπὶ δούλων ἢ ξένων, Dübner, IX, vs. 67). Cf. Leo, l. l., p. 71 ff. But even the best characterization of the real nature of satire (as Horace or Lucian practised it) may be paralleled by a description of the old comedy, for the *ridentem dicere verum* of Horace (concerning which see Kiessling, Hor. II, p. xiii) does not differ from the character ascribed to the writers of the old comedy in the most learned and best of the treatises π. κωμ. (Dübner, III), according to which παιδείας εὐτραπέλου γινόμενοι ζηλωταὶ τοὺς ἀγῶνας ἐποιοῦν.

<sup>4</sup> On the other hand, *iambicus* = *scriptor saturarum* in Apuleius, Apolog. 10: C. Lucilium, quamquam sit *iambicus*, tamen improbarim quod Gentium et Macedonem pueros *directis nominibus* carmine suo prostituerit. *Directis nominibus* (= ὀνομασί) was the manner of the old comedy.

<sup>1</sup> E. g. Fritzsche, p. 13, note 2, uses the words *ridicula intexta versibus* (II), which are said of the *exodia*, to confirm a statement in his characterization of the *saturae*. He describes the latter also as "eine rein extemporirte Naturpoesie," and immediately afterwards refers to the words *descripto iam ad tibicinem cantu*!

fact that they are said to be produced by professional actors, and we must infer that a stage of thoroughly-developed dramatic form is herewith indicated,<sup>1</sup> even though not possessing a general plot (*argumentum*). The only other descriptive words are *ab risu ac soluto ioco*, in paragraph 11, which refer back to the *saturae*. Meagre as this description is, it must be confessed, I think, that it corresponds in general outlines to the brief characterizations of the old comedy contained in the treatises *περὶ κωμῳδίας* prefixed to the scholia of Aristophanes. Throughout them the old comedy is characterized by two traits, a playful spirit of fun (*γέλως, τὸ χαρίεν*) and a license in the use of abusive jest (*ἄδεια τοῦ σκώπτειν, σκώμματα*),<sup>2</sup> qualities which are indicated here by the words *risus ac solutus iocus*.<sup>3</sup> By *impletas modis* may very well be suggested something of the manifold musical and metrical form of the parabasis.<sup>4</sup> The word *satura* itself, however, in the Lucilian sense, is the real characterization of the drama here described, conveying unmistakably the idea of *φανερῶς καὶ ὀνομαστὶ σκώπτειν* (*κωμῳδεῖν*), which is only faintly repeated in *soluto ioco*.

In striking and unexpected confirmation of this result (since Livy has commonly been supposed<sup>5</sup> to be our only authority for

<sup>1</sup> The language of Livy (*argumento fabulam serere* = *componere*, cf. 38, 56, 8) indicates that the designation *fabula* (play) might have been attached to the *saturae*, although they lacked the *argumentum* (*μῦθοι*) of the more artistic drama, founded by Livius.

<sup>2</sup> An. π. κωμ. (Dübner, IXa, vs. 72): "Ἰδιον δὲ κωμῳδίας τὸ μεμιγμένον ἔχειν τοῖς σκώμμασι γέλωτα. Platonius π. διαφ. κωμ. (Dübner, I): ἄδειαν . . . εἶχον σκώπτειν κτλ. Idem π. διαφ. χαρ. (Dübner, II): ὁ Ἀριστοφάνης ἐπιτρέχειν τὴν χάριν τοῖς σκώμμασι ποιεῖ. Ibid.: Εὐπολὺς . . . ἐπίχαρις καὶ περὶ τὰ σκώμματα λίαν εὐστοχος. To the same effect is a Latin scholium of a Plautus MS of the Collegio Romano (4 C. 39), reported by Ritschl, Op. I, p. 7: Comoedias esse oportet refertas *cavillis* quae σκώμματα vocant Graeci et *cachinnis* quas γελασίας vocant.

<sup>3</sup> These last two words would not unnaturally receive a much milder interpretation when the meaning of *saturae* was not understood. How closely *solutus* might interpret *ἄδεια* appears from various legal uses of the word, noted in the lexicons, and in this connection especially from Caecina ap. Cic. ad Fam. VI 7, 3: *solutum existimatur esse alteri male dicere*. For *iocus* cf. Hor. Ep. II 1, 149 and the discussion of that passage below, p. 21.

<sup>4</sup> Platonius π. διαφ. κωμ. (Dübner, I, vs. 51): ἡ δὲ παράβασις ἐπληροῦτο ὑπὸ μελῳδρίῳ καὶ κομματίῳ καὶ στροφῇ καὶ ἀντιστροφῶν κτλ.

<sup>5</sup> So also Leo, who has seen so much deeper in these questions than any other scholar: "Eine solche *satura* vorhistorischer Zeit erscheint nur an dieser Stelle" (l. l., 77). It has long been recognized that Valerius Maximus (II 4, 4) paraphrases Livy ignorantly.

this prehistoric *satura*) appears Euanthius in the treatise *de comoedia*, prefixed to the scholia of Terence.<sup>1</sup> Here a survey of the origins of tragedy and comedy is followed by some general considerations concerning the development of the latter, after which the author turns to the different stages of the history of comedy, beginning with the ἀρχαία, which he also calls ἐπ' ὀνόματος, *quia inest in ea denominatio civium de quibus libere describebatur. etenim per priscos poetas . . . res gestae a civibus palam cum eorum . . . nomine decantabantur.* But because the liberty granted this form of composition was abused, *ne quisquam in alterum carmen infame componeret lege lata siluere. Et hinc deinde aliud genus fabulae id est satyra*<sup>2</sup> *sumpsit exordium, quae a satyris, quos inlotos semper ac petulantes deos scimus esse, vocitata est: etsi <alii> aliunde . . . nomen prave putant.* A *satura* appears here as a *genus fabulae*, concerning which I am not aware that much has been said. A. Teüber,<sup>3</sup> who has touched on the subject incidentally, apparently represents the common interpretation in understanding *satyra* of the satyr-drama, in which view Scheidemantel<sup>4</sup> acquiesces. But a closer consideration of Euanthius' words will show that this is wholly impossible. For, in the first place, a comparison of this etymological digression with Diomedes' (Suetonius<sup>5</sup>) discussion of the same word reveals, as has been seen, that they are from the same source, and makes the inference almost inevitable that by *satyra* some phase of Roman satire is referred to. Furthermore, with what propriety would the satyr-drama occupy any place in the history of comedy, and especially as here, intercalated between the old comedy and the new?<sup>6</sup> That is an absurdity which is not to be

<sup>1</sup> Euanthius et Donati commentum de comoedia ex rec. A. Reifferscheid, Prog., Breslau, 1874.

<sup>2</sup> Euanthius certainly wrote *satyra*, as the MSS have it, and not *satira* (Reifferscheid). Cf. Marx, Interp. hexas altera, Prog., Rostock, 1889: "Tamen saeculo quarto demum et quinto p. Ch. *satura* forma eiecta est e litteris Latinis, illo scilicet aevo, quo Euanthius . . . Suetonium secutus docuit satyram a satyris vocitatam esse," etc. (p. 13).

<sup>3</sup> De auctoritate commentorum in Terent. quae sub Aelii Donati nomine feruntur, Prog., Eberswalde, 1881.

<sup>4</sup> Quaestiones Euanthianae scripsit E. S., Diss. inaug., Lips. 1883, p. 11. Cf. also Reifferscheid, Suetonius, p. 12 (testimonia).

<sup>5</sup> Diomedes, p. 485 (Suetonius, Reif., p. 20): "*satura* autem dicta sive a satyris etc. . . alii autem dictam putant," etc. Cf. Marx, Int. hexas, II, p. 13.

<sup>6</sup> Euanthius (Reif., p. 5): *coacti omittere satyram aliud genus carminis νέαν κωμῳδίαν . . . reperere poetae.*

credited even to the much-abused Euanthius. The position of this *satyra* between the old and the new comedy might in itself have aroused a suspicion that it is but a designation of the μέση (the absence of which Teuber censures and Scheidemantel seeks to explain), without the conclusive evidence of the words following: *haec satyra igitur eiusmodi fuit ut in ea quamvis duro et velut agresti ioco de vitiis civium tamen sine ullo proprii nominis titulo carmen esset*, an unmistakable reference to the αἰνυματοδῶς κωμῳδεῖν of the middle comedy, as Leo has seen.<sup>1</sup> We find, therefore, *satura* in Euanthius as a designation—shall we say of the middle comedy or of a Roman parallel to the μέση? It is a matter of very little difference, for it does not appear that he distinguishes at all between the history of Greek and Roman literature.<sup>2</sup>

I have said that this passage affords a confirmation of my view that *satura* in Livy is the designation of a Roman parallel to the old comedy. But the confirmation is, at least, not complete, if the same word is used in Euanthius of the middle comedy. It is possible, however, to show quite conclusively, I believe, that in the source (whether immediate or not) of Euanthius' account *satura* was used of the old comedy, or rather of a Roman parallel to it. After narrating the causes for the decline of this middle

<sup>1</sup> I had observed this fact before noting that Leo had made the same observation. But Leo's incorrect interpretation of *satura* in Livy apparently prevented him from seeing that the *satyra* of Euanthius refers to the middle comedy, and, as will be shown immediately, must have been used of the old comedy in his source. The common interpretation of *satyra* in Euanthius is not shared by Leo and Marx, who apparently hold that it is used of Roman satire, and owes its characterization as a *genus comoediae* to the wider sense of the latter word, "cum κωμῳδεῖν et κωμῳδία voces ad quodvis fere ludibrii genus significandum usurpentur" (Wachsmuth, *Sillographi Graeci*, p. 25). But Euanthius testifies to the dramatic character of the *satura* which he has in mind by designating it first as a *genus fabulae* (afterwards *genus comoediae*), while it should be observed, further, that it is one thing to use *comoedia* as a Greek equivalent for *satura* in the manner indicated by Wachsmuth, but quite a different thing to employ (as Euanthius does) *satura* to designate a *genus fabulae*, which we have seen corresponds to the middle comedy, and it is this distinction which Leo and Marx have confused.

<sup>2</sup> This appears not only from this use of *satura*, but also from his reference to its etymology, his mention of Lucilius below in connection with it, and the following reference to the writers of the new comedy: *ut igitur superiores illae suis quaeque celebrantur auctoribus, ita haec vix κωμῳδία cum multorum ante ac postea tum praecipue Menandri Terentiique est*. The same thing is observable elsewhere, e. g. Porphyrio ad A. P. 221. See below, p. 22, note 2.

comedy, in words which I shall quote below, he adds: *quod primus Lucilius novo conscripsit modo, ut poesin inde fecisset id est unius carminis plurimos libros*. From these words it would appear that Lucilius had written satire in the manner<sup>1</sup> of the middle comedy *sine ullo proprii nominis titulo*, a statement so directly opposed to the uniform testimony of antiquity concerning him that no one will believe it was contained in Euanthius' source; however, its relation to that testimony is not so remote as the character thus assigned to Lucilius is false. What the source did contain we may infer with certainty from the words of Horace concerning the relation of Lucilius to the old comedy (*hinc omnis pendet etc.*), already quoted, and from Diomedes' (Suetonius<sup>2</sup>) definition of *satura* as a *carmen maledicum ad carpenda hominum vitia archaeae comoediae caractere compositum, quale scripsit (scripserunt) Lucilius [et Horatius et Persius]*.<sup>3</sup> In short, the connection of Lucilius and satire with the old Attic comedy was a commonplace of literary criticism, and it is certain that Euanthius' source did not represent it otherwise.<sup>4</sup> *Satura*, therefore, must have appeared in it as the equivalent of the old comedy, with Lucilius' relation to it as usual.<sup>5</sup> To explain the peculiar disturbance of the original arrangement, by which *satura* was made to represent the middle comedy instead of the old, must be, of course, a matter of conjecture. The description of Livy will help us here, in which we observed that transition was made immediately from the *saturae* to the more artistic drama introduced by Livius Andronicus—that is, from the old comedy to the new, or, in the words of Euanthius, *coacti omittere saturam aliud genus carminis νέαν κωμωδίαν hoc est novam comoediam reperere poetae*. Now, if we conceive of Euanthius as using for the source of his sketch of comedy some

<sup>1</sup> *Novo modo* does not, of course, refer to a new direction given to satire by Lucilius, but simply explains the fact that, whereas before Lucilius' time a single play (*poema*) had been called *satura*, he gave this designation to his thirty books (*poesis*). Cf. Varro, Sat. Menip. 398 (Bücheler).

<sup>2</sup> Diomedes, p. 485; Sueton. (Reif.), p. 20.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Leo, l. l., p. 69, and see p. 11, note 2.

<sup>4</sup> A somewhat similar confusion of usual relations, and apparently for the same reason, viz. to harmonize two conflicting accounts, is found in Lydus de mag. p. r. I 41, where Lucilius is put in relation with Rhinthon, while the later satirists (Horace, Juvenal) appear Κρατίων καὶ Εὐπόλιδος χαρακτήρα ζηλώσαντες.

<sup>5</sup> Leo also reckons this passage among those connecting Lucilius with the ἀρχαία (l. l., p. 73, and Rh. Mus. 38, p. 327).

Roman account containing such a twofold division,<sup>1</sup> in which *satura* (= ἀρχαία) was followed by the new comedy, it will be easy to imagine that the most natural method of harmonizing<sup>2</sup> this view with the more common threefold division would be to leave the relation of *satura* to the *véa* unchanged, and to prefix a first stage, which of necessity would be the ἀρχαία.<sup>3</sup> The inevitable consequence of this would be to make *satura* appear in the place of the middle comedy, with a statement of its appropriate character as αἰνιγματώδης, quite regardless of the description given of its nature, which, as might have been expected, shows traces of its original application to the ἀρχαία.<sup>4</sup>

Having found thus an independent confirmation of the use of *satura* as an equivalent of the old comedy, we turn once more to Livy's account.<sup>5</sup> To trace its relation to Aristotle further will not, I think, be without interest in itself, and it will lead us to other results concerning the history of this word *satura*. Bernays, in one of the most admirable of his monographs,<sup>6</sup> has very clearly

<sup>1</sup> Such a division would correspond to the παλαιά and the καινή of Aristotle, as the passage of Livy shows. Elsewhere in Roman literature (Quintilian, X 1, 66; Velleius, I 16, 3; Suetonius, Reif., p. 9) a twofold division of comedy, the old and the new, is found, although not due, perhaps, to the immediate influence of Aristotle. Cf. Kaibel, Zur attischen Comödie, Hermes, 24, 59 ff.

<sup>2</sup> The treatise π. κωμ. V (Dübner) contains a contamination of the twofold and threefold divisions of comedy, as Kaibel has seen (l. l., p. 62).

<sup>3</sup> May there possibly be some trace of this process in the fact that Euanthius carries back the designation ἀρχαία to the *cunabula ipsa ortus sui*, a somewhat greater antiquity than was usually attached to this name?

<sup>4</sup> Attention is called to the supplementary note on p. 30.

<sup>5</sup> The meagreness of our record does not enable us to determine whether Caesius Bassus had reference to this *satura* or not in the following passage: Poeticae species Latinae. Epos sive dactylicum, epigramma, iambica, lyrica, tragoedia, *satyra*, praetextata, comoedia, tabernaria, Atellana, Rhinthonica, mimi (G. L. VI, p. 274). The fact that the *Atellana* is included, as well as the direct statement that these are *species Latinae*, makes it seem improbable that the satyr-drama is here meant, although its position next to tragoedia would suggest that possibility.

<sup>6</sup> Ergänzung zu Aristoteles Poetik, Rh. Mus. 8 (1853), p. 561 ff. In revised form it is the second of Zwei Abhandlungen über die Aristotelische Theorie des Dramas (Berlin, 1880). Cf. esp. pp. 148-53. To it apply most aptly Usener's words (Gesam. Abhandl., preface, p. v): "Aus den Edelsteinen, die sein Spürsinn und Finderglück aus dem Schutt der Ueberlieferung hervorgrub, liebte er und verstand es wie wenige, durch Schliff und Fassung kleine Kunstwerke zu gestalten."

shown the attitude of hostility which Aristotle assumed toward the old comedy,<sup>1</sup> and how his whole theory of poetry is based on the very antithesis of the personal element, which was its dominant characteristic. Accordingly, in his rapid sketch of comedy in the Poetics, of all the writers of the *ἀρχαία*, Crates alone is mentioned (the rest being comprehended in the censorious *ιαμβικὴ ἰδέα*), and for the reason that he was the first to give up the comedy of personal satire and to make the beginnings of a new form in accordance with more universal principles of art. In the Latin account Livius Andronicus is made to play the rôle of Crates, while the approbation with which the innovation of the latter is recorded by Aristotle is reproduced here in the words *postquam . . . ab risu ac soluto ioco res avocabatur et ludus in artem paulatim verterat* (11). The considerations already advanced would suffice to show that these words are uttered in the spirit of Aristotelian theory, even without the confirmation afforded by the following schematic description from the excerpts *περὶ κωμῳδίας*, which form the basis of Bernays' *Ergänzung*, etc., and which go back, in part at least, to lost portions of the Poetics: *τῆς κωμῳδίας· παλαιά, ἢ πλεονάζουσα τῷ γελοίῳ. νέα, ἢ τοῦτο μὲν προειμένῃ, πρὸς δὲ τὸ σέμνον ῥέπουσα*.<sup>2</sup>

But Crates, though the founder<sup>3</sup> of the new comedy, is always classed with the old, as one whose period of life fell chiefly within its limits and whose contemporaries still cultivated the *ιαμβικὴ ἰδέα*. Might a similar relation between Livius and his contemporaries have been recognized, by which more point would have been given to this comparison? For it will be seen that the analogy between Livius and Crates would appear much more complete, if younger contemporaries of the former could be likened to the writers of the *ἀρχαία* of and after Crates' time.<sup>4</sup> This place was

<sup>1</sup> Cf. esp. *Ethic. Nic.* IV 14, 1128a, 20; *Poetics*, 9, 1451b, 11, and the passage quoted above.

<sup>2</sup> π. κωμ. e cod. Coisliniano ad fin., Vahlen<sup>3</sup>, p. 80; Bernays, l. l., p. 139.

<sup>3</sup> In π. κωμ. V, Aristophanes appears as the inaugurator of the new direction in comedy, and for the same reason that Crates is represented as such by Aristotle: *καὶ γὰρ τὸ τοῦτον δράμα ὁ Πλοῦτος νεωτερίζει κατὰ τὸ πλάσμα*, which is only a technical way of saying *πρῶτος ἤρξεν καθόλου ποιεῖν μίθους*. Cf. p. 10, note 3.

<sup>4</sup> That *saturae* were produced after Livius' abandonment of them, the language of the account implies (*primus . . . ausus est* etc.), although we shall not yet, perhaps, dare to affirm that we have other evidence to that effect. But see below concerning Naevius

supplied by Naevius, who probably did, in fact, strive to reproduce something of the spirit of the old comedy<sup>1</sup> and who, at any rate (which is the important and sufficient fact for our purposes), was put in relation with it by Varro, because he made use of the ὀνομαστὶ κωμῳδεῖν: *de Naevio quoque accepimus, fabulas eum in carcere duas scripsisse, Hariolum et Leontem, cum ob assiduam maledicentiam et probra in principes civitatis de Graecorum poetarum more dicta in vincula Romae a triumviris coniectus esset. Unde post a tribunis plebis exemptus est, cum in his, quas dixi supra, fabulis delicta sua et petulantias dictorum, quibus multos ante laeserat, diluisset* (Gellius, III 3, 15). Naevius thus being compared with the poets of the old comedy, the only natural classification for Livius, who was somewhat older, would be in the same category; while the palpable fact that Livius' comedies were of the character of the middle and the new, rather than of the old, comedy would be no obstacle to this classification, since the relation of Crates to his contemporaries was similar.

Does this throw any light on the perplexed question of the *satura* of Naevius? Our authority for attributing to him a composition, or compositions, thus designated is a solitary quotation preserved by Festus,<sup>2</sup> introduced by the words *ut Naevius in satyra*. It would be hazardous to trust implicitly any explanation of the character of a literary work the knowledge of which depends upon so slender a thread of tradition; but I believe that our investigation has put us in a position to venture a more plausible conjecture concerning this *satura* of Naevius than has, to my knowledge, been made. In the scant record of Naevius' literary activity nothing is brought out with more distinctness than his emulation of the ὀνομαστὶ κωμῳδεῖν of the old comedy. The character of his attacks and their result we know from the passage of Gellius already quoted, as well as from other sources, nor would a portion of Euanthius' account of the *satura* describe them inaccurately: *quod item genus comoediae multis offuit poetis, cum in suspicionem potentibus civibus venissent, illorum*

<sup>1</sup> See Mommsen, Röm. Gesch. I<sup>6</sup>, pp. 892 and esp. 900.

<sup>2</sup> Festus, p. 257: *Quianam pro quare . . . positum . . . apud antiquos, ut Naevium in satyra: quianam Saturnium populum pepulisti*. Concerning the metrical form of this line cf. Luc. Müller, Q. Ennius, p. 106, who observes that it cannot be determined. Birt, Zwei polit. Satiren, p. 18, note 1, calls attention to the anapaests in it.

*facta in peius descripsisse ac deformasse genus<sup>1</sup> stilo carminis.* But we have found *satura* here and in Livy used to describe and designate dramatic compositions corresponding to the old comedy, and what, therefore, is more probable than that in this quotation of Festus, *ut Naevius in satyra*,<sup>2</sup> we have the word in the same sense? Indeed, it would be in no way surprising if this description of Euanthius was originally a mere generalization from the career of Naevius. For, without denying that other causes may have been at work, I believe it entirely in accord with the aetiological methods of the literary historians and investigators, to whom this hypothesis of an old Roman comedy is to be attributed, that they should have assumed this division of Roman comedy, in imitation of the Greek, for the purpose of providing an αἴτιον for the ὀνομαστὶ κωμωδεῖν of Naevius,<sup>3</sup> in connection with the legislation of the XII tables against any form of composition *quod infamiam faceret flagitiumve alteri.*

Parallel and related<sup>4</sup> to Livy's account is a well-known passage of Horace descriptive of the beginnings of the drama, which I shall here produce, for the immediate purpose of confirming and illustrating the proposed interpretation of *satura*, although some other points, affecting the relation of the two descriptions to each other and to their source, may not inappropriately be added—(Epp. II 1, 145 ff.):

*Fescennina per hunc inventa licentia morem  
versibus alternis opprobria rustica fudit,  
libertasque recurrentis accepta per annos  
lusit amabiliter.*

<sup>1</sup>*Deformasse genus* seems almost like a specific touch in allusion to Naevius' attacks upon the family of the Metelli.

<sup>2</sup>For the form of the citation (which is not in the usual manner of Festus in citing plays) cf. Varro, L. L. V 25: itaque eum *Afranius* Putilucos *in togata* appellat. Perhaps Festus did not understand the word correctly, considering it either the name of a play or else a satire. Cf. Gellius, VI 9, 1: *Q. Ennius in saturis*, and Quintil. IX 2, 36: *quas in satura tradit Ennius*.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. O. Jahn, *Hermes*, 2 (1867), p. 225: "Der Grammatiker, der wie Aelius Stilo bei Cicero (Brut. 205) antiquitatis et in inventis rebus et in actis scriptorumque veterum literate peritus war, musste namentlich anzugeben wissen, von wem, wann, wie jede Neuerung oder Erfindung, wie die Alten sagen, ausgegangen sei."

<sup>4</sup>See editors of Horace ad loc., esp. Kiessling, and Leo, l. l., p. 81, note.

The close parallelism between this description and Livy's account of what preceded the *saturae* will not escape any one when the two passages are once compared, and was long since pointed out by editors of Horace<sup>1</sup> and Livy. But the relation of the following lines of Horace to Livy has been perhaps surmised,<sup>2</sup> but not understood, nor could it have been without the interpretation of *satura* here set forth. We shall see, however, that they contain a description of this same Roman parallel to the old comedy which we have found elsewhere:

*donec iam saevus apertam  
in rabiem coepit verti iocus et per honestas  
150 ire domos impune minax. doluere cruento  
dente lacesciti, fuit intactis quoque cura  
condicione super communi; quin etiam lex  
poenaeque lata, malo quae nollet carmine quemquam  
describi.*

What Horace describes is in fact the *λαμβική* *idéa* of the old comedy—its *assidua maledicentia et probra in principes civitatis*, as Varro said of Naevius<sup>3</sup>—to express which a series of peculiarly appropriate words is used.<sup>4</sup> It is not therefore, I believe, either a matter of chance or of stupidity that the scholium of Porphyrio, which has seemed to the editors of Horace so strange or so absurd that they have ceased to refer to it, does, in fact, thus interpret it: *tam diu iocari per carmina licuit, donec per iocum multis impune laceratis dedissent omnes operam, ut lege caveretur, ne quis carmen infame componeret. qua re consitutula, silentium est impositum archaeae comoediae, in qua nominatim vitia (vita, Meyer) civium carpebantur (carpebatur, id.).* It is hard to

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Kiessling ad vs. 145.

<sup>2</sup> I observe that Heinrichs (Juvenal, vol. II, Einl., p. 9), and probably others, have suggested that the *saturae* of Livy's account were among the *mala carmina* described by Horace.

<sup>3</sup> Ap. Gell. III 3, 15, quoted above, p. 19.

<sup>4</sup> *Saevus iocus* = σκώμματα, the *solutus iocus* of Livy. *Rabies*, cf. Hor. A. P. 79: *Archilochum proprio rabies armavit iambo*, and π. κωμ. II: Κρατινός . . . τὰ τοῦ Ἀρχιλόχου ζηλώσας, and the description that follows of the virulence of his attacks. With *per honestas domos* cf. the σκώπτειν εἰς πλούσιους καὶ ἐνδόξους of π. κωμ. IV. *Impune* contains the ἄδεια τοῦ σκώπτειν (*describere*, vs. 154, "das eigentliche Wort für das persiflierende Abschildern," Kiessl., Sat. I 4, 3) of the old comedy. In *apertam* (148) there is reference to the προφανώς (φανερῶς) σκώπτειν (κωμῳδεῖν).

believe, in the face of so many specifically Roman allusions,<sup>1</sup> that Porphyrio or his source should have failed to see that this description is meant to apply to Rome, nor do I think that such dullness is to be attributed to him. The fact is that, like Euanthius (as above described, p. 15) and his own practice elsewhere, he does not distinguish consistently between Greek literature and actual or assumed Roman parallels to it<sup>2</sup>; so that here, if we have already established the point that there was an assumed Roman ἀρχαία, it is entirely legitimate to refer his words to it, which otherwise are thoroughly meaningless, and to confirm thus the proposed interpretation of this passage of Horace by direct evidence.

Concerning line 152 ff. (*quin etiam lex*), Kiessling has conjectured that the provision of the XII tables imposing capital punishment *si quis occentavisset sive carmen <malum> condidisset quod infamiam faceret flagitiumve alteri* is put in this connection solely for the purpose of securing a Roman analogy to the legal restrictions imposed upon the ὀνομαστὶ κωμῳδεῖν at Athens. That this, in fact, is the case is put beyond question (1) by the relation shown to exist between the descriptions of Livy and Horace and the old comedy, as well as (2) by a comparison of Horace's words with the following account of the check which had to be applied to the license of comedy at Athens: An. π. κωμ. (Dübner, IV 14), . . . κωμῳδεῖν ὅν ἄν βούλωνται ἀκωλύτως. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἡ κακία προέκοπτεν (*donec iam saevus etc.*), οἱ πλούσιοι καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες<sup>3</sup> μὴ βουλόμενοι κωμῳδεῖσθαι (*fuit intactis etc.*)

<sup>1</sup> Not to mention vs. 103, with which this part of the letter begins, *Romae dulce diu etc.*, observe the lines just preceding this passage, 143 ff.: *Tellurem porco, Silvanum lacte piabant, || floribus et vino Genium memorem brevis aevi. || Fescennina per hunc etc.*

<sup>2</sup> An excellent illustration is afforded by Porphyrio's note ad A. P. 221: "mox etiam agrestis Satyros nudavit *hoc est: satyrica coeperunt scribere ut Pomponius Atalanten vel Sisyphon vel Ariadnen.*" The parallelism of the *Atellanae* and the Σάτυροι was, however, by no means so close in fact as it was represented. Cf. also Suetonius (Reif.), p. 5. Again, on A. P. 281, *vetus comoedia* and *nova* are spoken of in the same sentence, the former referring to the Greek ἀρχαία, the latter to the Roman reproductions of the *veta*, as *hac* shows. Further, when Euanthius (p. 5) says that the poets of the old comedy produced *non ut nunc ficta penitus argumenta*, it is impossible to say whether *nunc* refers to the Greek or Roman *veta*.

<sup>3</sup> That is, the leading citizens, to whom *cura condicione super communi* would naturally belong.

τοῦ μὲν φανερώς κωμωδεῖν ἐκώλυσαν (*quin etiam lex etc.*).<sup>1</sup> This passage, it will be seen, is not paralleled in Livy's account. The omission is noteworthy. The transition from the old comedy to the new, Aristotle intimates, was not made under compulsion—indeed, it is unlikely that he would have admitted the motive of compulsion<sup>2</sup>—but was due to the insight of Crates. The treatises *περὶ κωμωδίας* attribute it to the fear of the law, and this view Horace follows, whether because he found it so in his sources, or whether he combined Aristotelian theory with facts peculiar to Roman history, as, for instance, the recantation of abuse on the part of Naevius (cf. Gellius, III 3, 15, p. 19 supra):

*Vertere modum formidine fustis*

155 *ad bene dicendum delectandumque redacti.*  
*Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit et artis*  
*intulit agresti Latio.*

*Formidine fustis* has already been considered. The full significance of verse 155 may not appear at first sight, nor its relation to Livy's description. At all events, its importance here has been wholly missed by A. Nauck and Luc. Müller,<sup>3</sup> who agree in considering it spurious, while other editors, who have touched on this point,<sup>4</sup> have not been more successful in showing its relation

<sup>1</sup> The same account in IXa and IXb, Dübner.

<sup>2</sup> Bernays, *Ergänzung*, etc., p. 152: "Ein Menander, z. B., würde nicht mehr zum *ὀνομαστὶ κωμωδεῖν* der alten Komödie zurückgekehrt sein, wären auch die dasselbe verpönenden Psephismata plötzlich aufgehoben worden; strenger noch als von der athenischen Theatercensur war ihm ein solches zurückfallen in das 'iambische Wesen' von den ästhetischen Gesetzen seiner Dichtgattung verboten, die mit Aristoteles das Poetische in dem Allgemeinen (*καθόλου*) erkennt."

<sup>3</sup> Ad loc. (annotated edition, Vienna, 1893). With what Müller says concerning the inappropriateness of the verse, if we think of Horace as attempting to represent an actual condition of primitive Rome, and not as following a model set by the best literary criticism of Greece (Aristotle), we may well agree, for it is probably true "dass der grösste Theil der Zuhörer, ihrem italischer Charakter Gemäss, gerade durch die früheren Schmähgedichte besonders ergötzt werden musste." The objections, from the editor's point of view, are well taken, but, instead of betraying a spurious line, they betray Horace's source, as will appear.

<sup>4</sup> Kiessling (whom Orelli-Mewes quote with approval), Schütz and others compare the *exodia* of Livy's account with Horace's description of the change of tone—how incorrectly will be seen presently.

to Livy. Now, if this account is parallel to Livy's, we should expect that these words would refer to the transition from the old comedy to the new—that is, that they should correspond in general meaning to the words concerning the abandonment of *saturae* and the composition of plays with a general plot, which we have seen are used in harmony with Aristotle's account of the transition from the old to the new comedy. To show that they do, let us return for a moment to Aristotle's estimate of the artistic and ethical character of these two kinds of dramatic composition. To him the old comedy of abusive wit and of personal attack was not art. Even Homer, he saw, had grasped with better insight the real nature of comedy, οὐ ψόγον ἀλλὰ τὸ γελοῖον δραματοποιήσας. To the same effect are his rules concerning the γελοῖον,<sup>1</sup> preserved from the lost second book of the Poetics, of which Bernays says: "Sie sollen dem Komischen den Charakter des heiteren Spasses wahren, es abscheiden von dem groben, nackten Schimpfen, von dem persönlichen, bitteren Spott" (l. l., p. 148). This will perhaps serve to make my meaning clear when I affirm that the words *vertere modum . . . ad bene dicendum delectandumque redacti* reproduce the Aristotelian characterization of the transition from the old comedy to the new. For *ad bene dicendum*, employed merely as antithesis to *malo carmine*, suggests the *maledicentia*<sup>2</sup> of the former period—that is, the old comedy—while *delectandum* characterizes the new. This interpretation may seem at first to force unnatural significance into simple words, and if this account were not so closely allied to one which can be proven to depend upon Aristotle, the objection might be allowed; but whatever force it has ought to be removed by the following words of the Stagyrice himself, which, while ostensibly spoken of the σκώπτειν in general, are in fact, as the context shows,<sup>3</sup> said of the phases of it illustrated by the history of comedy: πότερον οὖν τὸν εὖ σκώπτοντα ("der wahrhaft komische Scherz," Bernays) ὀριστέον . . . τῷ μὴ λυπεῖν τὸν ἀκούοντα, ἢ καὶ τέρπειν; (Eth. Nic. IV 14, 7)—words which might pass for the original of Horace's verse. It appears, therefore, that to Aristotle's charac-

<sup>1</sup> Under the rubric ὁ ἐκ τῶν πραγμάτων γέλως, from the excerpts π. κωμ. e cod. Coisl., Vahlen, p. 79; Bernays, p. 138.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Porphyrio ad loc.: bene dicendum autem non 'diserte dicendum,' sed 'non male dicendum' significat, hoc est 'non lacerandum ac vituperandum.'

<sup>3</sup> Ἴδοι ἂν τις καὶ ἐκ τῶν κωμωδιῶν τῶν παλαιῶν καὶ τῶν καινῶν, ib. 6.

terization of the new comedy belonged, not only the plot (*μῦθοι*) with its general treatment (*καθόλου*)—both of which are contained in the technical *argumentum*—but also the result produced by this means, the *τέρπειν τὸν ἀκούοντα*. The former is set forth in Livy's account, the latter in Horace's; but somewhere, whether in Aristotle or in the common source of Livy and Horace, both were united,<sup>1</sup> for Euanthius presents them in this form in his description of the transition to the new comedy: *coacti omittere satyram . . . novam comoediam reperere poetae, quae argumento communi magis et generaliter ad omnes homines qui mediocribus fortunis agunt pertineret et minus amaritudinis spectadoribus et eadem opera multum delectationis afferret etc.* That should suffice, I think, to support my contention that this line (155) represents the transition from the old to the new comedy in accordance with Aristotelian theory as clearly as Livy's description of the same thing.

It must now be clear, I believe, that the account of Horace is entirely parallel to Livy's, and that both reproduce the three stages of the development of comedy set forth by Aristotle: (1) the *φαλλικά* (*Fescennina licentia*), (2) the *ιαμβική ἰδέα* (*saturae, aperta rabies*), and (3) the true comedy of *μῦθοι* (*argumentum*), the object of which is to please (*τέρπειν, delectare*), and not to attack (*μὴ λυπεῖν, benedicere*). A somewhat different treatment is accorded to the same material in the two writers, Livy giving detailed and more technical points of reference, such as the relation of Livius Andronicus to this development, while Horace, as a poet, handles the subject in more general outlines. But in a general way the points of reference expressly given by Livy are indicated by Horace. For instance, the words *Graecia capta* play the same rôle in Horace's description as Livius Andronicus does in that of Livy. To be sure, commentators are not agreed as to their interpretation, but it certainly seems most natural to refer them to the conquest of Magna Graecia (as is done by Kiessling and many of the best interpreters of Horace new and

<sup>1</sup> A connecting link between these two elements is afforded by a scholiast's note on Aristoph. *Equit.* 538, which says of Crates, to whom Aristotle ascribes the *καθόλου μῦθους ποιεῖν*: *Σμικρὰ ἐποίει καὶ ἑτερπε τοὺς ἀκροατὰς, γράφων ἡδέα*. Cited by Meineke, *Historia Critica*, p. 61.

<sup>2</sup> *Minus amaritudinis spectadoribus*, it is probably superfluous to say, is the *μὴ λυπεῖν τὸν ἀκούοντα* of Aristotle and the *benedicere* (i. e. *non maledicere*) of Horace.

old), the period from which the influence of Greek literature and culture began to be felt at Rome. With this interpretation (to the confirmation of which this comparison contributes) the relation between the part played by Livius Andronicus in Livy's account and the words *Graecia capta* may be pointed out as follows: From fear of punishment poets changed their tone, ceasing from personal attack and devoting themselves purely to amusing their audiences. At the words *formidine fustis . . . redacti*, Romans familiar with the history of their own literature must inevitably have thought of Naevius,<sup>1</sup> the one conspicuous example of a Roman poet whose *παρηγορία* cost him dear, and who was obliged to make the transition *ad bene dicendum delectandumque* in order to escape from prison. That carries us, to be sure, a step beyond Livius Andronicus, who was the inaugurator of the new departure in comedy, just as, for example, Aristophanes was considerably younger than Crates, but the next sentence brings us back to the period before Naevius, indicated by the words *Graecia capta*, i. e. Livius (who, as we know, was 'a captive Greek'), under whose influence the drama *in artem paulatim verterat*, and so in like manner *Graecia capta . . . artes intulit . . . Latio*. But there is no inconsequence in referring *Graecia capta* to a period earlier than that implied in the words *ad bene dicendum etc.*, as will be seen when it is remembered that the old comedy and the new overlapped, and that a description of the decline of the old and of its transition to the new carries us a generation beyond Crates and the beginnings of the new.

157

*Sic horridus ille*

*defluxit versus Saturnius et grave virus  
munditiae pepulere.*

*Sic* refers not to *Graecia capta* alone, as the punctuation of most editions indicates, but to the whole foregoing description of which these words introduce the last member, and Kiessling, Orelli-Mewes and others are therefore quite right in placing a period after *Latio*. "In the manner thus described (*sic*) the uncouth Saturnian metre (in which the *versus alterni* of the *Fescennina licentia* were uttered, as the demonstrative *ille* shows) gradually disappeared, and the refinement of taste which Greek art brought

<sup>1</sup> As the commentators *ad loc.* observe.

about, assisted by the legal restrictions imposed upon personal attack, drove out the *grave virus*<sup>1</sup> of the iambic *idēa*." In short, these words—*sic . . . pepulere*—are a résumé of the three periods described, the *Fescennina licentia* with its *horridus numerus*, the *aperta rabies* of the old comedy, which *grave virus* repeats so accurately as to preserve the same figure, and the *munditiae* of the new era of the artistic drama. Parallel to this are the words of Livy, who, after narrating the development of the *Fescennini* to *saturae* and the creation of the artistic drama by internal (*argumento*) and external (the peculiar form of the canticum) modifications, comprehends the progress to that point, before going over to an account of the survival of the ancient *Fescennini*, by the words *lege hac fabellarum* (which, as has been pointed out above, p. 5, note 2, should logically refer to the whole development to this point—that is, as Horace has it, *sic*) *ab risu ac soluto ioco res avocabatur et ludus in artem paulatim verterat*.

*Sed in longum tamen aevum*

160 *manserunt hodieque manent vestigia ruris.*<sup>2</sup>

To what do these words refer? Commentators are by no means agreed, some holding that by them is meant the survival of the Saturnian metre, others that they refer to the crudeness and carelessness of execution admitted even by great poets down to the end of the republic. The clue to their interpretation, how-

<sup>1</sup> For this interpretation of *virus* cf. Martial, VII 12, 5 ff.:

Quid prodest, cupiant cum quidam nostra videri,  
Si qua *Lycambeo sanguine* tela madent,  
*Vipereumque* vomat nostro sub nomine *virus*,  
Qui Phoebi radios ferre diemque negat?

Cf. also Mart. XIII 2, 8: qui se mirantur, *in illos virus* habe, and Mart. Capella, IX 988 (Eys., p. 371): iambus dictis est ab eo quod . . . *venenum* maledicti aut livoris infundat. For the epithet *grave* cf. Mart. I 87, 5, in addition to the examples given by Bentley.

<sup>2</sup> Porphyrio ad loc., *vestigia ruris: rusticitatis*. I have not observed that an apparent reminiscence of this passage in Ovid (A. A. III 127) has been pointed out:

Sed quia cultus adest, *nec nostros mansit in annos*  
*Rusticitas*, priscis illa superstes avis.  
.....  
*Munditiis* capimur.

ever, as has been seen, is the fact that *vestigia ruris* is clearly a reminiscence of the *opprobria rustica* of vs. 146. The *vestigia ruris*, therefore, should be *carmina Fescennina*, while the emphasis which is laid upon the 'rusticity' of these productions (*rustica, ruris*) perhaps has reference to their supposed origin in a country town of Etruria, as well as to their coarseness.<sup>1</sup> There was still another form of literature, which continued to be produced when Horace wrote, characterized by 'rusticity' in this double sense of origin and coarseness, viz. the *Atellanae*,<sup>2</sup> and it is, I believe, to these two forms especially that these words are meant to apply.<sup>3</sup> Now, it is scarcely a matter of accident that in Livy, after the transition from *saturae* to the new comedy of Livius Andronicus has been described, we are told that *ridicula*, like the old Fescennines (*more antiquo*), were taken up, and eventually passed over, for the most part (*potissimum*), into the *Atellanae*, the language implying, however, that they continued to exist apart from them—that is, as *carmina Fescennina*. It would appear, therefore, that Horace here also is following the same source as Livy, although for his purpose he gives it quite a different turn. For while in Livy the old *iocularia* of the *inventus* are represented as revived in the *ridicula* (*exodia*) for the sake of explaining aetiologically<sup>4</sup> the privileged position of the *actores Atellanarum*, the *opprobria rustica* of the earlier period are represented by Horace as a reprehensible survival of bad taste in the face of a more artistic development, being thus put in line with the general contention of the letter. It is perhaps merely an accidental coincidence that Horace describes the continuance of the spirit of the ancient *Fescennini* in words almost identical with Aristotle's account of the survival of the φαλλικά, ἃ

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Martial (X 19), who says of his tenth book, "mit seiner selbst bei M. beispieldlosen Frechheit" (Mommsen):

Nec doctum satis et parum severum  
Sed non rusticulum nimis libellum, etc.

<sup>2</sup> Varro uses *rustici* of the characters in them without further definition (L. L. VII 96, cf. 84). Orelli cites Fronto (p. 70, R.) concerning their chief representatives, Novius and Pomponius *particulatim elegantes in verbis rusticis et iocularibus et ridiculariis*. Cf. also Pomponius, vs. 7 (Ribbeck).

<sup>3</sup> So also Orelli ad loc.: *hodieque*] praecipue in carminibus Fescenninis et in mimis Atellanisque.

<sup>4</sup> See above, p. 3, note 4, and O. Jahn, l. l.

ἔτι καὶ νῦν (*hodieque*) ἐν πολλαῖς τῶν πόλεων διαμένει (*manent*) νομιζόμενα,<sup>1</sup> or was this passage of Aristotle, in connection with another, perhaps the common starting-point for the version of Livy and Horace? At all events, the statement of the continuance of the φαλλικά, beside the regular development of comedy, and the fact that, as the beginnings of comedy, they were said to have been produced by ἐθελονταί<sup>2</sup> (*iuventus*) would afford just the combination of data to explain the position of the *actores Atellanarum*, which Livy's account presents.

It is scarcely necessary to point out the significance of the results we have reached for the history of Roman satire, which they affect in so far as they show that the employment of the word *satura*, to designate compositions before the time of Ennius, is a later transference of it in the Lucilian sense. But briefly it may be said that they confirm the view set forth by Kiessling—namely, that Ennius adopted this designation for a collection of his miscellaneous poems, under the influence of a number of usages of the adjective form *satura* containing the common underlying notion of variety, and that from this use of the word, adopted in the same sense by Pacuvius and, in the first instance, by Lucilius, it passed over into its later censorious meaning from the aggressive quality of the poems, which Lucilius comprehended under this title. This process we may perhaps illustrate by the transference of meaning that has taken place in the word *epigram*, from the colorless signification of inscription, to that of a thought wittily or tersely expressed; while, as was also the case with *satura*, the original use of the word has survived, as a less common one, beside the derived meaning. This view, it will be found, is in most complete harmony with the best (indeed, the only direct) evidence of antiquity on this subject, which does not carry us back of Ennius and which ascribes the aggressive element in satire to Lucilius.

In explanation of the reason for the assumption of a Roman comedy parallel to the ἀρχαία, I have suggested above (p. 20) that it may have been aetiological. Mere parallelism, however, is a factor of no small significance. But we are probably not yet

<sup>1</sup> Poetics, 4, 1449a, 12.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Poetics, 4, 1449a, 9: (γενομένης ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτοσχεδιαστικῆς) . . . ἡ κωμῳδία . . . ἀπὸ τῶν τὰ φαλλικά (ἐξαρχόντων), and *ib.* 5, 1449a, 38: ἡ δὲ κωμῳδία . . . ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐλαθεν· καὶ γὰρ χορὸν κωμῳδῶν ὅψε ποτε ὁ ἀρχων ἔδωκεν, ἀλλ' ἐθελονταὶ ἦσαν.

in a position to give a final and certain explanation, which must await a more comprehensive knowledge of the methods of the earliest literary historians of Rome. For the present, to have furnished an illustration of them may suffice.<sup>1</sup>

MADISON, WIS.

GEORGE L. HENDRICKSON.

<sup>1</sup>Concerning the source to which this literary parallelism that we have discussed goes back, it is probably impossible for us to arrive at a definite conclusion and to distinguish Varronian from pre-Varronian property. The assumption is so monstrously unhistorical that one is inclined to doubt whether Varro can have been the author of it (though it seems probable that he adopted it), and to assign it rather to one of his less critical predecessors, as, for instance, Accius. It was natural that the earliest Roman philology should follow the lines of its Greek models with a childish faithfulness, in spite of the widely differing conditions, and that it did so is sufficiently well known. Accius was no exception to this rule, and his tendency to conform things Roman to Greek models is proved by examples adduced by Norden (in his recent Varroniana, Rh. Mus. 48 (1893), p. 536), as well as by the fragment from the Annales, preserved by Macrobius, I 7, 37, in which the Saturnalia are carried back to Attic origin. But, on the other hand, the designation of this assumed old comedy as *satura* cannot have arisen earlier than the time when the aggressive character of satire was thoroughly recognized and its analogy to the *ἀρχαία* pointed out. At the same time it is conceivable that the assumption may have existed before the name *satura* was attached to it. One other point deserves mention in this question of source, viz. the fact that the accounts of Livy and Horace, and the source of Euanthius, reveal the twofold, Aristotelian division of comedy, and not the Alexandrine (?) threefold division. But it is impossible to discuss the bearings of this, and other points here raised, at present, and to some I shall hope to return at a later time.

[NOTE, supplementary to pp. 16 (ad fin.) and 17. The confusion presented by Euanthius' identification of *satura* with the middle comedy is paralleled so closely by Tzetzes (in the *στίχοι π. διαφ. ποιητ.*, vs. 77 ff., Dübner) as almost to raise a suspicion of dependence: *τριττὴν νόει . . . τὴν κωμωδίαν· πρώτην, μέσην κτλ. . . . πρώτης μὲν ἦν ἰδιὸν ἐμφανὲς ψόγος· ἥς ἦν κατάρξας εὐρετὴς Σουσαρίων. ἥς δευτέρας ἦν ὁ ψόγος κεκρυμμένος, ἥς ἦν Κρατῖνος, Εὐπόλις κτλ.* Here we have the comedy of Cratinus and the rest designated as the *μέση* and characterized as *αἰνιγματώδης* (*ψόγος κεκρυμμένος*), just as in Euanthius the *satura* is described as a comedy *sine ullo proprii nominis titulo*. In Tzetzes, as in Euanthius, the distortion of usual relations is due to an effort to harmonize the ordinary threefold division with the twofold, and apparently with the particular form of the latter division presented by Suetonius (Reif., p. 9), and elucidated by Kaibel (l. l., p. 64), in which the comedy of Susarion is distinguished from that of Cratinus and his successors. It was to this primitive (*vixdum incipiens*, Euanth.) comedy of Susarion (*εὐρετὴς*, Tzet.) that Tzetzes and Euanthius attached the *ἐμφανὲς ψόγος*, and thus compelled themselves to characterize the second period as *αἰνιγματώδης*.]

## II.—A COLLATION OF THE ANCIENT ARMENIAN VERSION OF PLATO'S LAWS, BOOKS V AND VI.

### BOOK V.

The first paragraphs of this book, pp. 726–32 B, are cited in Stobaeus, whose text conflicts in many points with the Paris MS No. 1807, e. g. in 726 E for τῶν αὐτοῦ κτημάτων he gives τῶν ἐν τῇ βίῳ κτ.; 726 E for πάντ' ἐστὶ πᾶσιν: παρὰ πᾶσιν; 726 E ὥσπερ νῦν τὰ for ὅσπερ νυνδὴ τὰ; 727 B ὧδε πολλοῦ for ὁ δὲ πολλοῦ; 727 C ζῆν τοῦτο for τὸ ζῆν πάντως, Ficino: "hanc vitam"; 727 D ἡγούμενος for ἡγουμένης; 728 A παντὸς μὲν οὖν for πάντως μ. ο.; 728 A οὐδ' ὡς εἰπεῖν for ὡς δὲ εἰπεῖν; 729 C γενεθλίου for γενέσθαι οὖς, where the former is the true reading; 729 D εὐμενὲς for εὐμενεῖς; 729 D φίλων καὶ for φίλων τε καὶ; 729 E παρὰ τῶν πολιτῶν for παρὰ τὰ τῶν; 730 B ὅς' οὖν for ὅς' ἂν; 730 B omits καὶ εὐμενεῖς; 731 C omits τῶν before αὐτοῦ; 731 D omits τὰ before κακὰ ἔχων; 732 B διώκειν αἰεὶ for διώκειν δεῖ, the former being the right reading.

Here we have seventeen cases of conflict between the text of Stobaeus and that of the Paris MS. In fifteen of them the Paris text is probably right, and is followed by Schanz in his edition; in the remaining two cases the Paris text is wrong, and Schanz adopts the reading of Stobaeus. In all these seventeen cases the Armenian Version takes sides with the Paris MS against Stobaeus.

There remain, however, a number of passages in which the Paris text still conflicts with Stobaeus, but in which the Version is either neutral or agrees with Stobaeus. These are the following: 726 E the Paris MS has τῶν οὖν αὐτοῦ τὰ δεσπόζοντα, Stob. has τῶν οὖν δύο τὰ δ., the Version τῶν οὖν τὰ δεσπ., "ex illis igitur quae imperant," the τῶν being rendered as a demonstrative pronoun. The reading which Ficino had cannot be certainly inferred from his rendering: "profecto quae dominantur prae illis quae serviunt, semper sunt honoranda." It accords best with the Armenian, omitting both δύο and αὐτοῦ.

727 A ἡ τισιν ὑπείξεσιν, Paris MS; ἡ τ. ὑπεῖξαι, Stob.; ἡ τισιν ὑπείξας, Arm. Here Fic. goes with the Paris text "vel obsequiis."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Where the Armenian seems to yield a sound reading an asterisk is prefixed as in A. J. P. XIV 334 foll.

727 B *ἐξαιρῇ* in Stobaeus. So the Arm. and Ficino. The Paris MS has the corruption *ἐξαίρη*.

726 C. The Paris MS has *ὅπότεν . . . λύπας μὴ διαπονῇ καρτερῶν ἀλλὰ ὑπείκη, τότε οὐ τιμᾷ ὑπείκων ἄτιμον γὰρ αὐτὴν ἀπεργάζεται*. Here *ὑπείκων* is superfluous. Stobaeus read instead of it *ἀτιμάζων*, which, as following *οὐ τιμᾷ* and preceding *ἄτιμον γὰρ*, is also superfluous. \*The Armenian reads *τότε οὐ τιμᾷ ἄτιμον γὰρ*, which is probably right.

\*728 B. The Paris text followed by Schanz has *καὶ ἀποσχίζεσθαι*; Stobaeus has *καὶ τῶν μὲν ἀποσχ.*, which is implied by the Arm. and by Ficino: "seque ipsum ab eis seiungat, improbis autem adhaereat." On the one hand the zeugma *τοὺς μὲν ἀγαθοὺς φεύγειν . . . καὶ ἀποσχίζεσθαι* is harsh; on the other, the second *μὲν*, coming before the first has been answered by a *δὲ*, is awkward. It is as likely that *τῶν μὲν* was added to avoid the first, as that it was omitted to escape the second. But if the interrelations of the sources throughout this 5th book be borne in mind, we must adopt the reading in which Ficino and the Armenian concur with Stobaeus. For that they both reflected in 729 C the corruption of the Paris text *γενέσθαι οὓς*, where Stobaeus has the true reading, constitutes them a single family as against him. If, then, two members of this family agree in reading *τῶν μὲν* with the opposite family, we may be sure that its omission in the Paris MS is a mere idiosyncrasy of that MS.

728 D. The Paris text reads *μηνύειν δὴ μοι*. Stobaeus omits *μοι*. The Arm. omits *μοι*, but also omits the stop after *νομοθέτου*. Ficino retains *μοι*, but omits the stop: "quorum differentia a legislatore declaranda mihi videtur: ut puta, honore dignum corpus esse non quod formosum aut robustum est."

The Armenian Version merits notice in the following passages:

727 A. The Paris MS has *θεῖον γὰρ ἀγαθόν που τιμή*. Here Schanz conjectures *ψυχὴ* for *τιμή*; Stallbaum retains *τιμή* but conjectures *θεῖων γὰρ ἀγαθῶν*. Stobaeus and Ficino agree with the Paris text. The Armenian is equivalent to *θεῖον γάρ τι ἢ τιμή ὅν* (or *οὓσα*). This in no way helps the text.

728 A. Schanz reads *πάντως μὲν οὖν λυπεῖ*. Stobaeus and the Paris MS have *παντὸς μὲν οὖν λείπει*, though the latter probably read originally *πάντως*, since there is an erasure after the *τ*. Ficino renders: "sed ab hoc longissime abest." The Arm. = "verum tamen ab hoc est omnino deficiens." The two translators must have read *πάντως μὲν οὖν τούτου ἐλλείπει*.

729 C. The words ταύτου φύσιν αἵματος ἔχουσιν are rendered as if ταύτου φύσεως (or φύσει) αἵματος μετέχουσιν. This is probably a mere device of rendering.

729 E. The Arm. has θεοῖς καὶ ἀνθρώποις instead of ἀνθ. κ. θ. The variant would not be worth noticing, but that Ficino also has it: "apud deos et apud homines."

730 A. The Armenian has ἔτυχεν, along with the Paris Codex, where Badham conjectures ἀπέτυχεν. For the rest the translator renders ἰκέτας ἰκέτης ἰκετεύσας as if they were οἰκέτας, etc. Perhaps the corruption was in his Greek.

730 B. The Arm. indicates ἀπεργάζηται, a less violation of the Paris text than is the omission of ἂν after ὅσα. It is also favored by Ficino: "ut non lex, sed laus . . . refrenet magis et obtemperatiores ferendis legibus faciat."

730 D. Arm. reads νικηφόρος ἀρετῇ, with the Paris Codex.

730 E καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα ἀγαθὰ τις ἔκτεται δυνατόν μὴ μόνον αὐτὸν ἔχειν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄλλοις μεταδιδόναι· καὶ τὸν μὲν μεταδιδόντα κ. τ. λ. Here ἔκτεται δυνατόν must be wrong, and Schanz conjectures δύναται and αὐτὸς; Petavius κέκτεται καὶ δύναται and also αὐτὸς. The Arm. = "et quae alia bona potuerit quis acquirere, non solum eum habere sed et alios participes efficere." This implies κεκτῆσθαι δύναται and αὐτὸν, which last depends upon χρῆ in the preceding clause. The editors, in suggesting αὐτὸς, do not seem to have seen this, though the Arm. translator so took it. The sense is then as follows: "This same praise it is necessary to speak also about temperance and wisdom, and whatever other goods any one can make himself possessor of (it is necessary) that he not only should himself have them, but that he should also impart them to others."

Stobaeus and Julian read κέκτεται δυνατόν; so also did Ficino, who also translates as if he had had ὅς instead of ὅσα: "Et qui aliis bonis abundat, quae in alios quoque transfundi possunt, si ceteros participes efficit, tanquam vir summus est honorandus."

731 B πρὸς εὐδοξίαν. The Arm. involves πρὸς εὐσέβειαν, a probable enough variant, though unsupported from other sources.

730 C ὅτῳ δὲ ἀκούσιον, ἄνους· ὧν οὐδέτερον ζηλωτόν· This, the reading of Ficino, Stobaeus and the Paris Codex, is unquestionably the right one. The Arm. has ὅτῳ δὲ ἀκούσιον, ἄνους ὧν οὐκ ἂν εἴη ζηλωτός. The reading of Clemens Alex.: ἄνους ὧν, οὐ ζῶον· οὐδ' ἕτερον οὖν ζηλωτόν, points to a very old corruption of the passage.

731 C ἐν οὖν τῷ τιμιωτάτῳ. The Armenian adds αὐτοῦ after οὖν, "in the noblest part of himself."

731 D τῷ δ' ἀκράτως. So the Armenian. Ficino has: "qui vero ita flagitiosi sunt, ut incurabiles sint," which led Ast to conjecture ἀνιάτως.

731 E. The Arm. omits δεῖν before εἶναι τοιοῦτον.

732 A. The Arm. implies προτιμᾶν for τιμᾶν.

732 A. It has εἰάν τε παρ' αὐτοῦ εἰάν τε παρ' ἄλλου μᾶλλον πραττόμενα, where the MSS and editions have αὐτοῦ and ἄλλου.

732 B. After διώκειν for αἰεῖ, which is the reading of Stobaeus, the Arm. has δεῖ πάντα. The Paris MS has δεῖ simply.

\*732 C παραγγέλλειν δὲ παντὶ πάντ' ἄνδρα πᾶσαν καὶ ὅλην περιχάρειαν. So Schanz emends this passage, which in the Paris MS contains for πᾶσαν κ. ὁ. π. the impossible words καὶ ὅλην περιχάρειαν πᾶσαν. Various other conjectures have been attempted. The Armenian gives what must be the true reading, as follows: παραγ. δὲ π. πάντ' ἄνδρα ὅλως πᾶσαν περιχάρειαν. Stephanus wrote of the passage thus: "Puto igitur te meae coniecturae subscripturum, qua in locum nominis ὅλην substituo ex eo factum adverbium ὅλως."

\*732 C. The words which follow have been the despair of successive editors. The Paris Codex reads thus: κατὰ τε εὐπραγίας ἱσταμένου τοῦ δαίμονος ἐκάστου καὶ κατὰ τύχας, οἷον πρὸς ὑψηλὰ καὶ ἀνάντη δαιμόνων ἀνθισταμένων τισὶν πράξεσιν, ἐλπίζειν δ' αἰεὶ τοῖς γε ἀγαθοῖσι τὸν θεὸν ἃ δωρεῖται πόνων μὲν ἐπιπιπτόντων ἀντὶ μειζόνων ἐλάττους ποιήσειν τὸν δ' αὖ νῦν παρόντων ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον μεταβολάς, περὶ δὲ τὰ ἀγαθὰ τὰ ἐναντία τούτων αἰεὶ πάντ' αὐτοῖς παραγενέσθαι μετ' ἀγαθῆς τυχῆς.

The spaced words are those which have offended critics. In the whole passage the Armenian involves the following changes:

1. ἐκάστῳ for ἐκάστου.
2. Omit δαιμόνων.
3. ἀνθιστάμενον for ἀνθισταμένων.
4. τῶν δ' αὖ for τὸν δ' αὖ.
5. Omit περὶ δὲ τὰ ἀγαθὰ.
6. πάντων for παντ' αὐτοῖς.

Of these changes, Nos. 1 and 2, viz. ἐκάστῳ and ἀνθιστάμενον, were conjectured by Badham. No. 4 is read in the apographa. Peipers (qu. crit., p. 100) would exclude τὰ ἀγαθὰ. The sense is better for the omission of δαιμόνων, which may be a double of δαίμονος in the preceding line. In other respects the Armenian does not assist the passage, but renders from ἐλπίζειν to the end in the following sense: "sed sperare semper bonis eis quae dat deus, et supervenientes aerumnarum loco maiorum minores facere; et iam praesentium in melius mutationes contraria horum

semper omnium advenire una cum bona fortuna." Comparing this with Ficino's rendering: "sperare semper boni viri debent, munera, quae talibus viris dare deus solet, sibi non defutura: ac si qui graves labores inciderint, Deum leniores eos facturum et praesentia in melius commutaturum, bona vero contra omnia una cum bona fortuna sibi affore," we may infer that both translators had a stop after *δωρεῖται*, in consequence, perhaps, of which they both inserted a conjunction before *πόνων μὲν*.

Later Platonists believed that every individual had his familiar spirit or demon watching over him, and a copyist sharing such a belief would have altered *ἐκάστω* to *ἐκάστου*. The Armenian translates *ἰσταμένου* as if the passage implied the metaphor of a balance in which the god inclines from side to side, from good luck to bad.

\*732 E *καὶ περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐκάστου, ποῖόν τινα χρεὼν εἶναι*. Here Hermann suggests *αὐτοῦ*, which Schanz reads. The Arm. = "et de sui quaque re, qualis esse oportet." This suggests either the entire omission of *τινα* or the substitution for it of *τι*. *αὐτοῦ*, which is in the Paris MS and is involved by the Version, can then be retained.

733 B. The Arm. reads *λύπης δὲ βουλόμεθα* and omits *ἀλλάττεσθαι*.

\*733 B *ἴσα δὲ ἀντὶ ἰσων ἐκάτερα τούτων οὐχ ὡς βουλόμεθα ἔχοιμεν ἂν διασαφεῖν*. Ficino: "pari autem modo utrumque horum habere nos nolle, possumus declarare." The Arm. = *ἴσα δὲ ἀντὶ ἰσων ἐκάτερα τούτων οὐ βουλόμεθα οὐδὲ ὡς οὐ βουλόμεθα κ. τ. λ.* The words supplied may easily have dropped out of the text. They were certainly in the Greek text which the translator used.

733 B *τοῖς τοιούτοις, [πρὸς βούλησιν]*. Schanz brackets *πρ. β.* The Arm. omits *προς* and puts the comma after instead of before *βούλησιν*.

\*733 C, D. The Arm. takes *τὸν ἰσόρροπον βίον* as governed by *διανοεῖσθαι*, and favors Badham's conjecture of *τὸν μὲν ὑπερβάλλοντα* for *τῶν μὲν ὑπερβαλλόντων*, but implies *τοὺς δ' αὖ* for *τῶν δ' αὖ*. It also omits the stop after *οὐ βουλόμεθα* in D, and omits the words *δὴ δεῖ διανοεῖσθαι*. Here Badham would read *δὲ* for *δὴ* and cut out the words *δεῖ διαν.*, of which all editors have found the threefold repetition in this passage intolerable.

733 D. The Arm. has *ὣν πέρι*, with the Paris Codex. Schanz adopts *ὣν περ*, the conjecture of Badham. \*In the next line the Arm. supplies *καὶ τὸ* before *ἀβούλητόν*. Stallbaum here conjectured *καὶ*.

733 E. For *ιδόντα* the Arm. implies *εἰδότα καί*. Ficino may have read *εἰδότα*, for he renders: "hisque cognititis."

734 B. The Arm. adds *καὶ* before *ἄκων*, so that the text runs *πᾶς ἐξ ἀνάγκης καὶ ἄκων*.

734 D *ἡδὶω τε εἶναι καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ὑπερέχειν*. The Arm. has *τοὺς ἄλλους*, scil. *βίους*.

735 A *ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν ἄρξοντας*. The Arm. seems to have read *ἄρξαντας*.

735 A *τοὺς σμικρὰς παιδεία*. The Armenian has the plural *σμικρὰς* or *σμικρὰ*. The Paris Codex *σμικρᾷ*.

735 A *καταστάσεις*. The Arm. = *κατάστασις*. In the Paris Codex this reading is given above the line. Stob. had the former.

\*736 A. After *ξυρρεόντων* the Arm. omits *ἐκ*, which "delevit Madvig." In the whole of the rest of the passage beginning 735 B and ending 737 C, the Armenian faithfully reflects all the readings of the Paris Codex to which critics have taken exception, viz. 736 A *ἀπαλλαγὴν*, 736 C *πείρα*, 736 C *εὐτυχεῖν ὡς γῆς καὶ χρεῶν κ. τ. λ.*, 736 D *ὑπάρχειν*, 737 A *μεταβάσεως* and *οὐδὲ μία* and *μετὰ δίκης* and *μηχανῆς διαφυγῇ*, 737 B *κοινῇ*.

736 E. Where the Paris Codex reads *νεμομένους* and Badham suggested *ἀπονεμομένους*, the Arm. = *δεομένους* or *αἰτουμένους*, which does not help.

\*737 D *πόλεις, γῆς μὲν*. The Arm. = *πόλεις γῇ μὲν*, according to Schneider's conjecture. The Paris Codex has *πόλεις γῆι*.

737 D *νῦν δὲ σχήματος*. The Arm. has *δὴ*.

737 E *ὁ λόγος ἴτω*. The Arm. = *ἔστω* for *ἴτω*.

737 E *διανεμηθήτω*. The Arm. = *διανεμηθέντα*, and just below it has *ξύννομα*, with the Paris MS, instead of *ξυννομή*. Just below the Arm. = *τρία τοῦ αὐτοῦ*, instead of *τρία τὸν αὐτὸν* of the Paris Codex.

738 A *οὐ μὲν δὴ πᾶς*. The Arm. has *ὁ μὲν δὴ* and omits *πᾶς*. The Paris Codex has *ὁ μὲν δὴ πᾶς*. So has Ficino.

738 B. After *ἅττα τε* the Arm. adds *εὐθύς*.

738 E *ὅπως μήτε αὐτός*. The Arm. = *ὅπως μήτις αὐτός*.

\*738 C *ἐπιπνοίας λεχθείσης θεῶν*. So the MSS and editions, but in what sense is a divine inspiration 'λεχθείσα'? The unpounded verb could hardly mean 'declared,' and an inspiration is not declared, but vouchsafed by heaven. The Armenian = "seu inspiratione a dis superveniente," which suggests the reading *ληχθείσης*. Cp. 750 E *τόποι χώρας ἐν οἷς θεία τις ἐπίπνοια καὶ δαιμόνων λήξεις*.

\*739 B *καὶ εἴ τις ἄλλος δὴ ποτε*. Here the Paris MS has *ἂν εἴ ποτε* instead of *δὴ ποτε*, which is Naber's conjecture. The Armenian involves *καὶ εἴ τις ἄλλος ἂν ποτε*.

739 D. The Arm. adds *ὡς* or *οἷον* before *καθ' ἐν ᾧ τι μάλιστα*.

\*739 D *εἰ μὲν δὴ τοιαύτη πόλις. εἴτε που θεοὶ* is the reading of the Paris Codex. Badham suggested *ἢ* for *εἰ*, and then *ἐστὶ που, θεοὶ δ'*. The Arm. = *ἐν μὲν δὴ τοιαυτῇ πόλει, εἴτε που θεοὶ*, which is probably right. Ficino perhaps had such a reading: "talem utique civitatem sive Dii alicubi sive Deorum filii uno plures habitent, ita viventes eamque servantes omni certe referti gaudis vivunt."

739 E *ἦν δὲ νῦν ἡμεῖς ἐπικεχειρήκαμεν, εἴη τε ἂν γενομένη πως ἀθανασίας ἐγγύτατα καὶ ἡ μία δευτέρως· τρίτην δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα, εἰάν θεὸς ἐθέλῃ, διαπερανούμεθα. νῦν δ' οὖν ταύτην τίνα λέγομεν καὶ πῶς γενομένην ἂν τοιαύτην.* This is the reading of the MSS. Heindorf suggests *εἴη γε ἂν, γενομένη πως*; and *ἡ μία* was by Cobet corrected to *πρώτης*. The Armenian = *ἦν δὲ νῦν ἡμεῖς ἐπικεχειρήκαμεν, ἥ τε μία μὲν καὶ ἡ δευτέρα εἴρηται. τρίτην δὲ μετὰ τ., ἐ. θ. ἐθ., διαπερανούμεθα, εἴη τε ἂν γενομένη πως ἀθανασίας ἐγγύτατα. νῦν δ' οὖν κ. τ. λ.*; or in Latin: *et ea quidem in quam nos nunc manum intulimus, quaeque una quidem, et quae secunda dicta est, Eam quae tertia est post haec, si deus velit, in finem ducamus. erit ἂν facta immortalitati proxima etc.* The passage remains obscure.

\*740 A and B. The Arm. = *ὡς ἄρα δεῖν τὸν λαχόντα τὴν λῆξιν νομίζειν μὲν κοινὴν τῆς πόλεως συμπάσης, τῆς κυρίας οὔσης τῆς λήξεως, πατρίδος δὲ οὔσης τῆς χώρας θεραπεύειν αὐτὴν δεῖ μειζόνως ἢ μητέρα παῖδας, τῷ δέσποιναν αὐτὴν καὶ θεὸν οὔσαν θνητῶν ὄντων νομίζεσθαι. καὶ περὶ τοὺς ἐγχ. θεοὺς τε ἅμα καὶ δαίμονας, ὅπως δὴ (? ἂν) ταῦτα εἰς τὸν αἰὶ χρόνον οὕτως ὑπάρχῃ κ. τ. λ.* In the above the Arm. omits the words *ταῦτα δ' ἔχειν διανοήματα*, which Usener would exclude, along with the words which follow as far as *δαίμονας*. Perhaps these words displaced in the Paris text the words *κυρίας* (or *τῆς κ.*) *οὔσης τῆς λήξεως*, which the Version supplies.

\*740 B *ὅ δ' οὖν*. So the Armenian. The Paris MS has *ὡδ' οὖν*.

\*740 C. The Paris MS has *θεραπευτὴν θεῶν καὶ γένους καὶ πόλεως*. The Arm. translates *θεραπευτὴν θεῶν καὶ πόλεως καὶ γένους*. So Ficino: "et civitatis et generis."

\*740 C *οἷς ἂν τῆς γενέσεως ἐλλείπῃ*. Stephanus conjectured *τὰ τῆς γ.* The Arm. = *οἷς ἂν ἡ γένεσις* (or rather *γεννήματα*) *ἐλλείπῃ*. Ficino: "civibus illis, quibus filii non sunt."

740 C *ἐπίγονοι*. Arm. = *ἐκγονοι*.

\*740 D *αὕτη σκεψαμένη*. The Arm. has *ταύτη* for *αὕτη*. Just below it omits *καὶ γὰρ ἐπισχέσεις* before *γενέσεως*, and then reads *οἷς ἂν εὖρους*, with the Paris Codex.

740 E. The Version has ἀπαντῶσαι, with the Paris Codex, where Schanz conjectures ἀπαντας αἱ.

740 E. The Version omits καὶ δὴ καὶ τό γε τέλος, and just below has ὦν ἂν, with the Paris Codex, for οἱ ἂν, and then ἐὰν δ' αὖ, with the apographa, for ἐάν τ' αὖ of the Paris MS.

741 A. The Version adds οἶον before κύμα, for which it rather implies κύματα; then κατακλυσμοῦ instead of κατακλυσμόν, and νόσους ἢ πολέμων φθοράς for νόσοι ἢ πολ. φθοραί. The whole clause would thus run: \*ἐὰν δ' αὖ καὶ τὸναντίον ἐπέλθῃ ποτὲ οἶον κύματα κατακλυσμοῦ φέρον νόσους ἢ πολέμων φθοράς. Ficino agrees with the Paris MS. Just below the Version agrees with the same codex in ὑπερβάλλειν, where Schanz adopts παρεμβάλλειν from the apographa.

\*742 B παρέμενος. So the Paris MS. The Arm. rather suggests παραιτησάμενος, which was the reading of Stobaeus.

\*742 E τὰ μὲν οὖν δυνατὰ βούλοισι' ἂν ὁ διακοσμῶν, τὰ δὲ μὴ δυνατὰ οὐτ' ἂν βούλοιο [ματαίας βουλήσεις] οὐτ' ἂν ἐπιχειροῖ. Schanz notes: "ματαίας βουλήσεις delevi"; but how did these words, which do not seem to be a gloss, get into the text? Ficino has: "possibilia igitur volet fundator legum, impossibilia nec volet, nam vana esset cupiditas, neque aggreditur." The Arm. = τὰ μὲν οὖν δυνατὰ βούλοισι' ἂν διακοσμῶν τὰ δὲ μὴ δυνατὰ ἂν βούλοιο καὶ ἐν ματαίαις βουλήσεσιν οὐκ ἂν ἐπιχειροῖ.

\*743 B ἔστιν δὲ ὁ μὲν ἀγαθὸς τούτων, ὁ δὲ οὐ [κακός], ὅταν ἡ φειδωλός, τότε δὲ ποτε καὶ πάγκακος. "κακὸς delevit Madvig advers. I, p. 442." The Arm. for οὐ κακός has οὐκ ἀγαθός, which must be right. It also omits δὲ after τότε.

\*743 D μήτε χρυσὸν δεῖν. The Arm. has εἶναι for δεῖν. Stobaeus has μήτε εἶναι χρυσὸν δεῖν.

\*744 A τί τε βούλομαι . . . καὶ ἀποτυγχάνω. The Arm. has τί τε βούλεται . . . καὶ ἀποτυγχάνει. So Ficino: "quid ipse velit, quid, si contigerit, bene succedet."

744 B. In this obscure section the Armenian exactly reflects the Paris Codex, except that instead of ἵνα ἀρχαί τε there stand words equivalent to *quam imperiūque* or ἡ ἀρχῆς τε (or ἡ ἀρχῇ τε).

744 C. The Arm. = τέτταρα μέγεθος.

744 D. The Arm. = προσῆκον ἐκάστοις ἑαυτοῖσιν τίμημα.

\*744 D τοῦ μεγίστου νοσήματος. So the Armenian, along with Stobaeus and Ficino: "summi morbi." The Paris MS has νομίσματος.

\*744 D. The Arm. = ὡς ἀμφοτέρων τικτόντων ταῦτα ἀμφότερα, with the Apographum Riccardianum. The Paris Codex has ἀμφότερα . . . ἀμφότερα.

\*744 D *νῦν οὖν ὅρον δεῖ*. So the Armenian, with the apographa. The Paris Codex has the corruption *δὴ*.

\*745 B *καὶ τὰλλα ὅσα πρόσφορα πόλει τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ἔχοντα τόπον ἐκλεξάμενον*. This must mean 'choosing among those available a site which has also whatever else is advantageous to a city.' Badham conjectured *πόλει ὑπάρχοντ'*. The Armenian omits *τῶν ὑπαρχόντων*, as did probably Ficino: "Post haec urbs primum in medio regionis, quoad fieri potest, condatur, in loco qui cetera quoque civitatis habeat commoda."

\*745 C *μετέχοντα ἐκάστοτε*. So Schanz. The MS has *ἐκάτερον*, which is clearly wrong. Ast suggested *ἐκατέρων*. The Arm. has *ἐκατέρων*, or rather *τὰ ἐκατέρων*.

\*745 D *τῷ πλήθει*. So Schanz, following the apographa. So also the Arm. and Ficino. The MS has *τῷ πάθει*.

\*746 A *ἐτέρων ὦν*. Badham conjectured *ἐτέρων ἃ*, which the Arm. actually involves.

\*746 B. The Arm. read *χρὴ δὲ ἀναλαμβάνειν πρὸς αὐτὸν*, omitting *πάντα*. The Paris MS has *αὐτὸν*. Just below the Arm. has *\*οἶμαι τόδε εἶναι*, where the Paris Codex has the corruption *τόνδε*.

746 D *δῆλον δὴ τὰ δώδεκα*. The Arm. has *δὲ* for *δὴ*.

\*746 D *καὶ πρὸς γε*. The Arm. adds *τούτοις*.

\*746 E *τόν γε νόμον τάττειν*. Here, for *νόμον*, which is read in the Paris MS, the Version reads *νομοθέτην*, with the apographa and Ficino.

\*747 A *κοινῷ λόγῳ νομίσαντα*. The Arm. = *κ. λ. ἀρμόσαντα*.

747 C *τῶν μελλόντων αὐτὰ*. The Arm. has *αὐτῶν* for *αὐτὰ*.

\*747 C. The Paris MS reads *εἴτε τις νομοθέτης αὐτοῖς φαῦλος ἂν γενόμενος ἐξεργάσατο*. Here Schanz reads *δὴ* for *ἂν*, and Stephanus conjectured *αὖ*. The Armenian omits *ἂν* and reads *αὐτὸς* for *αὐτοῖς*, which may well be the true reading, the *νομοθέτης αὐτὸς* being contrasted with *τύχη* and *φύσις ἄλλη τις τοιαύτη*.

747 D. The Arm. has *ὥς οὐκ εἰσίν*, with the MS, where Ficino rightly omits *οὐκ*.

\*747 D. The Arm. has *δι' εἰλήσεις*, which Ruhnken conjectured here.

\*747 D *ἐναῖσιοι*. The Arm. = *ἀνάρμοστοι οἱ ἄτακτοι*. The editors suggest various emendations. Ficino: "protervi."

\*747 D *οἱ δὲ καὶ διὰ ταύτην τὴν*. So the Paris MS. Schanz reads *οἱ δὲ καὶ διὰ τὴν*. The Arm. = *οἱ δὲ διὰ τὴν*, which is also the reading of Galenus.

\*750 E *τοὺς αἰὶ κατοικιζομένους*. So the Armenian and the apographa. The Paris MS has *τοῖς*.

## BOOK VI.

751 B τόνδε. παντί που—ἐξ αὐτῶν. The Arm., if rendered into Latin, reflects this obscure passage thus: Hocce. Omni quidem manifestum est tale quid, quod legislatione magno opere ente, civitatem bene compositam, magistratus non idoneos super eam constituere bene instituti, risusque propter haec valde nimius ἀν incidat, *verum etiam* calamitas et iacturae valde maximae civitatibus fiant ἀν ex illis. In the above τοῦ before πόλιν is not rendered, and so nothing is done to help the really crucial difficulty. The words τοῖς εὐ κειμένοις νόμοις οὐ μόνον οὐδὲν πλέον are also dropped out. \*The rendering of the words οὐδ' ὅτι γέλως—ἐξ αὐτῶν strikingly resembles that of Ficino, who thus gives the whole passage: "Audi iam. nemini dubium est, quod, cum magna res legumlatio sit, si quis civitati per leges bene paratae non idoneos magistratus constituat, quamvis leges bene positae sint, tamen non modo id nihil proderit risumque movebit, *verum etiam* calamitates maximas civitatibus pariet." The resemblance cannot be accidental, and points to a Greek original which read καὶ for οὐδ' ὅτι and ἀλλὰ καὶ for σχεδὸν δέ. This is the more probable because οὐ μόνον requires ἀλλὰ καὶ.

751 C. The Arm. has ἔπειτα αὐτοὺς, with the Paris Codex, for ἔπ. αὐ τοὺς.

\*751 D τεθράφθαι τε. Schanz brackets these words. Stallbaum removed τε, for which Ast conjectured δεῖ. The Arm. omits τε.

751 D πρὸς τοὺς δυσχεραίνοντας. The Arm. echoes this the reading of the Paris MS. The Aldine corrected τοὺς to τὰ. Just below the Arm. has ἐκατέρων, with the Paris MS and Ficino, where Stephanus read ἐκατέρου.

\*751 D ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἀγῶνα προφάσεις οὐ πάνν δέχεσθαι is the reading of the Paris MS. Schanz adds φασιν before οὐ πάνν, on the authority of the Scholiast ad Cratyl. 421 D. Hermann conjectured οὐ φασι for οὐ πάνν. The Arm. had ἀγών and δέχεται, which was also in Ficino's Greek text: "sed enim certamen excusationes non facile suscipit."

752 A. Schanz reads οὐκουν δὴ που λέγων γε ἀν μῦθον ἀκέφαλον ἐκὼν καταλίπομι· πλανώμενος ἀν ἅπαντι τοιοῦτος ὢν ἄμορφος φαίνοιτο. In his critical apparatus he notes that the Paris MS has ἀπάντη for ἅπαντι, but not that it reads γὰρ after πλανώμενος, which it does, according to C. F. Hermann. \*πλανώμενος γὰρ ἀν was also the reading of Ficino and of the Armenian translator. Ficino had ἅπαντι for

ἀπάντη, which Hermann accordingly brackets. The Armenian had ἀπάντη. Fic.: "nam si ita vagaretur, deformis omnibus appareret." Why should not a writer so saturated with Homer as Plato have read ἀπάντη?

752 B. The Arm. has βλέπων καὶ ποί, with the Paris MS; also in 752 C μείναιμέν, both of which Schanz corrects.

\*752 C χρόνον. So the Arm. and Schanz. The Paris MS adds ὄν.

752 D χώρας ἣ νῦν κατοικίζεται. Schanz notes of the Paris MS: "ἣ, sed in ras. (ἦν fuisse videtur)." The Arm. = χ. ἦν νῦν κατοικίζετε, which was also in Ficino's text: "quam nunc rempublicam conditis," and was also read by Stephanus.

752 D ἰσθῶσιν. This is Hermann's conjecture. The Paris reading στῶσιν was in the Armenian's Greek, also in Ficino's: "ut quam tutissime atque optime primi magistratus constituentur."

\*752 D δ' ἡμῖν. This conjecture of Hermann's for ἀν ἡμῖν is confirmed by the Armenian.

753 A τινι μετρίᾳ. The Arm. has τῇ, with the Paris MS.

\*753 B ὥς μὲν οὖν γένοιτ' ἂν ἐπιεικέστατα ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ἡμῖν τὰ νῦν, εἰρήσθω. The Arm. has εἴρηται for εἰρήσθω, and so had Ficino: "et quae tibi atque illis hac tempestate convenientissime fieri possunt, exposita."

\*753 B ἐν ταῖς σφετέραις αὐτῶν τῆς ἡλικίας δυνάμεσιν. For σφετέραις the Arm. has ἐκατέραις. Ficino omits: "bellis que in aetatis suae ordine interfuerunt."

753 C δεῖξαι τοὺς ἄρχοντας ἰδεῖν πάσῃ τῇ πόλει. The Arm. omits ἰδεῖν. So perhaps Ficino: "universae civitati magistratus ostendant."

\*753 D ἐξ αὐτῶν is omitted in the Version, as also by Ficino: "centumque ita secundo delecti rursus omnibus ostendantur."

753 D διὰ τομίῶν πορευόμενος. Ficino omits wholly these words. As to the Paris MS, Schanz notes: "versui δια] τομίῶν πορευόμενος ἐπὶ τὰ δὲ vitii nota in marg. adscripta." The Arm. renders διὰ τομίῶν as if δοκιμασίᾳ, probably because he did not understand a rare word.

\*753 E οἵτινες δὲ εἶεν ἂν πρὸς πασῶν τῶν ἀρχῶν γεγονότες, οὐκ ἔστιν; In the above Badham would omit δὲ. Schanz reads πρὸ for πρὸς and "οὐκ ἔστιν" delevit Badham." Ficino: "qui vero ex omnibus magistratibus deligantur, in iis nequaquam reperiuntur." The Arm. = οἵτινες δὲ εἶεν ἂν ἐκ πασῶν τῶν ἀρχῶν γεγονότες οὐκ εἰσίν. Ficino's obscure reading, whatever it was, was shared by the Armenian translator's text, but εἰσίν may be right.

\*754 B κατοικισθεισών. So the Arm. In Paris MS κατοικήσεων.

\*754 C λέγω δέ. The Arm. involves δὴ for δέ. So Ficino: "Repeto igitur, quod modo dixi."

754 D γενόμενοι. The Arm. omits. Ficino renders by "computati." ? καταλεγόμενοι.

\*755 A ὅπως ἂν τις πλέον ὑπερβάς ἐβδομήκοντα ζῇ, μηκέτι ἐν τούτοις τοῖς ἀρχουσι τηλικαύτην ἀρχὴν ὡς ἄρξων διανοηθῇτω. Here ὅπως ἂν is difficult, and ἐν τούτοις τοῖς ἀρχουσι is put out by Hug as superfluous. Ficino renders ὅπως: "hac utique ratione, ut qui septuagesimum annum excesserit, tantum magistratum non teneat." But ὅπως so used with διανοηθῇτω is very harsh, whether ἂν accompany it or not; while it is meaningless if construed with ζῇ. Hermann accordingly conjectures ὅπόσ' ἂν, and Heindorf ὅπόσον ἂν, and Badham ὅπόσ' ἂν τις πλέον' ἔχη, ὑπερβάς ἐβδομήκοντ' ἔτη μηκέτι. The Arm. hints at a solution, and is equivalent to: "si quis magis vixerit quam annos septuaginta, non amplius in his annis a magistratibus talem magistratum veluti tenens cogitetur." Whence it is certain that the Armenian translator's Greek omitted ὅπως ὑπερβάς. Is it possible, therefore, that they got into the Paris text from the margin? Perhaps they formed part of the words of which Badham suspected the loss after ἀπογράφῃ in §D just above.

\*755 D ἀνθ' οὗτου ὄντινα. The Arm. has τινα for ὄντινα.

755 D ὁπότερος. The Arm. has ὁποτέρως and omits the comma after διαχειροτονοῦμενος.

Except for these two variants in 755 D the Arm. reflects the Paris MS from 755 B–756 B, corruptions and all; e. g. in 755 E it has φυλακῇ for φυλῇ, and inserts the words φυλάρχους—αἰρείσθω in the wrong place in 756 B, two errors from which Ficino's text was free.

756 B οἷσπερ τῆς χειροτονίας μέτρον ἐκάστοις ἕκαστον ἦν. The Arm. adds μέλον before ἦν.

756 C. The Arm. omits κατὰ ταῦτα before καθάπερ τῇ πρόσθεν. Ficino simply: "eodem pacto."

\*756 E ἥς αἰεὶ δεῖ μεσεύειν τὴν πολιτείαν. The Arm. omits αἰεὶ and adds ἴσην before πολιτείαν instead of τὴν. Perhaps we should read ἰσοπολιτείαν, a word which occurs in Aristotle and often in Cretan inscriptions.

757 A. Schanz reads ἐν ἴσας τιμαῖς διαγόμενοι. The Arm. = ἐν ἰσοσίμῳ (or ἐν ἰσοτιμίᾳ) ἀγορευόμενοι. The Paris Codex has διαγορευόμενοι. Stobaeus διαγόμενοι.

757 A τοῦτο αὐτὸ δυναμένη. The Arm. = τοῦτο οὕτως δ.

\*757 B. The Arm. omits σφόδρα before ἡμᾶς διαταράττει.

\*757 B Διὸς γὰρ δὴ κρίσις. The Arm. adds ἡ before κρίσις.

757 B σμικρὰ μὲν ἐπαρκεῖ, πᾶν δὲ, ὅσον ἂν ἐπαρκέσῃ. The Arm. renders ἐπαρκεῖ in sense of 'immoratur,' as if παραμένει. It is noteworthy that Ficino had some other word than ἐπαρκεῖ, for he renders: "hominibus pauca semper suggeritur: quatenus autem suppetit."

757 D παρωνυμίοισι. The Arm. read ὁμωνύμοισι.

757 E ὅταν γίγνηται. The Arm. = ὅταν οὕτως γίγνηται.

758 A διαγομένη. Ficino renders by "posita." The Arm. answers to γιγνομένη. Perhaps it read διαγενομένη, with the Apographum Vossianum.

758 B. After ἀναγκαῖον the Arm. has δέ, with the Paris MS, where Schanz adopts Ast's conjecture δὴ.

758 D. The Arm. has διὰ, with the Paris Codex, but renders διαλύσεων in the next line, as if it were διακρίσεων 'diudicationum.'

759 A. The Arm. omits τε after νεωκόρους. Just below it reads ελεῖσθαι δεῖ, with the Paris MS, where Stob. has ἐλ. δὲ δεῖ. In the next section it has ἱερώων, with the MS, where again Stobaeus has ἱερέων.

759 D ἔτη δὲ μὴ ἔλαττον. The Arm. has ἔτι for ἔτη.

759 D. After ἐξηγητὰς the Arm. has τρεῖς, with the Paris text and Stobaeus, but in the next line it reads ἐξ αὐτῶν, τρεῖς δέ.

759 D ψῆφος, δοκιμάσαντας. Arm. = ψῆφός τε καὶ δοκιμασία. Perhaps a device of rendering.

759 E. After τοῖς ἱεροῖς the Arm. omits καὶ τεμενῶν.

760 A πόλεως μὲν οὖν αἱ φρουραὶ περὶ ταύτη. The Arm. = πόλεως μὲν οὖν τῆς φρουρᾶς περὶ ταύτη.

\*760 B ὁπότεν αἰρεθέντες. Arm. = ὁπότεν οἱ ῥηθέντες. Fic.: "postquam electi."

760 B νενέμῃται. So the Armenian. Eusebius has νενεμήσθω. Just below it retains φυλάρχους where Schanz adopts Eusebius' reading φρουράρχους.

760 C ἐκάστῳ δώδεκα τῶν πέντε. The Paris MS has δωδεκάτω written over what was perhaps δώδεκα τῶν. The Arm. perhaps implies δωδέκατον τῶν.

760 C ὅπως δ' ἂν. The Arm. omits δ', as does also Ficino.

761 C. In this difficult section the Arm. closely reproduces the Paris Codex, except in the following respects: For νάματα πάντα it has τὰ νάματα πᾶσιν. ἄλσος is rendered rather than δάσος. For εἰς αὐτὰ it rather indicates ἐνταῦθα or ἐνταυθοί. Then αὐτοῖς τε

καὶ γεροντικά λουτρά θερμά, omitting τοῖς γέρονσι. This omission may be due to the similarity of sound.

\*761 D ἱατροῦ δέξιν μὴ πάνυ σοφοῦ βελτίονα συχνῶ. The Arm. has δ' ἔξιν, with the Paris Codex, but βελτίονα συχνῶ is rendered as if it were βελτίον οὐ σπεύδειν 'melius non est urgere.' δέξιν, which Winckelmann would read for δ' ἔξιν, is ἀπαξ λεγόμενον not only in Plato, but very nearly in all Greek literature.

762 B. The Arm. has τούτων περί λαγχάνειν, with the apographa.

\*762 B πρῶτον μὲν δὴ. The Arm. omits δὴ, for which Badham conjectured δεῖ.

762 D ἡτιμώσθω. The Arm. has ἡ τιμάσθω. The Paris Codex ἡτιμώσθω. In the next section the Arm. has δεῖ δὴ where Stobaeus read δεῖ δε, and just below it retains τῷ before καλῶς ἄρξαι, where Stobaeus omitted it.

762 E ἔπειτα αἰ, Stobaeus. ἔπειτα εἰ, Paris Codex. Schanz adopts the former. The Arm. has ἔπειτα simply.

763 D ὅπως ἂν αὐτοῖς πέμπωσι . . . ὅπως . . . κοσμή. The Arm. = eo ut mittant ad eos . . . etenim . . . ornat, as if the Greek were ὅπως ἂν αὐτοῖς πέμπωσι . . . ὥς . . . κοσμεῖ.

763 E δέκα ἐκ τῶν ἄλλων χειροτονηθέντας. This is the Aldine reading. The Paris Codex has δέκα τῶν, and *h* and *a* gives in the margin δέκα ἢ τῶν. The Arm. = δέκα τῶν αὐτῶν χειροτονηθέντας or δ. τούτων χ.

764 C. The Arm. omits τῶν διδασκαλείων, which Ficino retains.

764 D. The Arm. perhaps had κόσμον τε καὶ and just below ἀρρένων τε καὶ, and read οἰκήσεων, with the Paris MS, instead of ἀσκήσεων. Perhaps Ficino read τε in each place: "qui disciplinae praesunt, gymnasiorum doctrinarumque ornatum et discendi ordinem curent: operamque dent, ut tam mares quam feminae in adolescentia honeste ad ista proficiscantur, honeste etiam commorentur."

765 B ἐκ προχειροτονηθέντων δέκα λάχη, δοκιμασθεῖς. For δέκα the Arm. suggests τῶν δέκα: "et unus quidem qui ex imprimis electis qui in decusse erant eveniat suffragio designatus." Perhaps the Armenian read τύχη also and omitted the comma before δοκιμασθεῖς.

\*765 C [τῶν] προχειροτονηθέντων μὲν εἴκοσι. The Arm. = προχειροτονηθέντες μὲν τῶν εἴκοσι. Schanz brackets τῶν.

765 E καὶ ἀγρίων καὶ ἀνθρώπων. The Arm. omits καὶ before ἀνθρώπων.

\*766 A ἀγριώτατον ὅποσα. The Arm. adds πάντων before ὅποσα: "ferocissimum est omnium quaecunque." F. A. Wolf conjectured τῶν. Ficino renders: "ferocissimum omnium, quae in terris

nascuntur." It is therefore certain that πάντων stood in the text of Ficino and of the Armenian.

766 A ὧν ἕνεκα οὐ δεύτερον οὐδὲ πάρεργον δεῖ τὴν παίδων τροφήν τὸν νομοθέτην εἶναι γίγνεσθαι· πρῶτον δὲ ἄρξασθαι χρῶν τὸν μέλλοντα αὐτῶν ἐπιμελήσεσθαι καλῶς αἰρεθῆναι τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει, ὃς ἂν ἄριστος εἰς πάντα ᾗ, τοῦτον κατὰ δύναμιν ὅτι μάλιστα αὐτοῖς καθιστάντα προστάττειν ἐπιμελητὴν. αἱ κ. τ. λ. Such is the reading of the Paris MS. Hermann and Schanz bracket αἰρεθῆναι, and for προστάττειν ἐπιμελητὴν the Aldine read προστάτην καὶ ἐπιμελητὴν. The Arm. from πρῶτον = "sed in primis sub dominatione esse necesse est eum qui bene curaturus est et placentem esse eorum qui in urbe sint summorum, ut ita optimus sit ad omne, hunc quidem prae viribus maxime super eos constituentem mandare curare." This rendering suggests that the translator read καὶ ἀρεσθῆναι for αἰρεθῆναι, that he added βελτίστων after πόλει, and read ὃς ἂν as if it were ὡς ἂν. \*It is also certain that for ἐπιμελητὴν the translator had ἐπιμεληθῆναι. The τ is a simple corruption of θ, and the terminal αἱ was lost, owing to the αἱ which follows. The sequence of the last clause thus becomes τοῦτον αὐτοῖς καθιστάντα προστάττειν ἐπιμεληθῆναι κατὰ δυν. ὅ, τι μάλ. 'this man he must set over them and bid him supervise to the very best of his ability.' If προστάττειν is retained, ἐπιμεληθῆναι must be adopted. The difficulties of the passage are much reduced if we suppose that καὶ ἀρεσθῆναι is the true reading, instead of αἰρεθῆναι, for we can then render as follows: 'And firstly to begin with, the (legislator) who is going to look after these matters well and to his own satisfaction (lit. and to please himself), must appoint over them whoever is of the citizens in all ways best, and order him to look after them to the very best of his ability.' καὶ ἀρεσθῆναι would easily be corrupted into αἰρεθῆναι. If, however, the added καὶ offends, we may suppose the original reading to have been καλῶς, ὡς ἀρεσθῆναι, and that ὡς was lost after καλῶς. The idea of selection made which is implied in the words which follow, viz. τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει ὃς ἂν ἄριστος ᾗ, would lead a copyist to write αἰρεθῆναι for ἀρεσθῆναι. καὶ ἀρεσθῆναι gives great point to καλῶς. The legislator is to supervise education thoroughly well, and in so doing to satisfy his own high ideal. Liddell and Scott give many instances of ἀρέσκω used in the passive in such a sense, though none of the passive aorist in so early a writer as Plato. In Theag. 127 B we have; εἰ οὗτος . . . ἀρέσκειτο τῇ σῇ συνουσίᾳ. But the same Arm. expression which is in this passage used to render αἰρεθῆναι, is in 767 B employed to

render *ἐλόμενοι*, so that little reliance can be here set on the Version. Ficino omits *αἰρεθῆναι*.

766 B *κάλλιστ' ἂν τῶν περὶ παιδείαν ἄρξαι γενομένων*. Here "delevit Hug" *γενομένων*. The Armenian seems to have read *γενόμενον*, but it is difficult to say what underlies it here.

767 D *θεὸν ὀνόσαντας*. The Arm. follows the Paris Codex in the error: *θεὸν ὀνομάσαντας*.

767 E *πρὸς τοῦτῳ παθεῖν*. Here the Paris MS has *τούτων* for *τούτῳ*. The Arm. gives *τούτων* also, but omits *πρὸς* before it.

\*768 C *ἡ δικῶν*. So the Paris MS. Stephanus conjectured *δικανικῶν*, following Ficino, who has "iudicialium"; Orelli, *νομικῶν*. The Arm. has *ἡδονῶν* for *ἡ δικῶν*, which suggests as the true reading *ἡδ' ὅλων*.

\*768 C *ταύταις μὲν οὖν εἰρήσθω πρὸς τῷ τέλει περιμένειν ἡμᾶς*. Stephanus renders this, the reading of the Paris MS, as follows: "hac itaque iubeantur nos ad finem expectare." Still, *ταύταις* is difficult, having no antecedent but *νόμων θέσις καὶ διαίρεσις*. Stephanus notes: "Affertur tamen et ista: ταύτης μὲν οὖν ἡ θέσις πρὸς τῷ τέλει περιμένει ἡμᾶς. The Armenian indicates as the true reading the following: *ταῦτα μὲν οὖν εἰρῆσθαι π. τῷ τ. περιμένει ἡμᾶς*. With which cp. Theaet. 173 C *ἕκαστος αὐτῶν (τῶν λόγων) περιμένει ἀποτελεσθῆναι ὅταν ὑμῖν δοκῇ*.

768 D *διοίκησιν*. The Paris MS has *διοικήσεων*, which the Armenian also reflects.

768 E. The Arm. omits *νῦν* before *τελευτῇ*. Stephanus also omitted it.

769 *μέχρι δεῦρ' εἴη τὰ νῦν διαπεπαισμένη*. For *εἴη* the Armenian had *ἴοι*, or more probably *ἦει*. Ficino renders *εἴη*: "huc usque nobis sit perlusus."

\*769 C *γράψαι τε ὥς*. The Arm. certainly had not *ὥς*, and probably not *τε*. Hensde conjectures *τέως* here.

\*769 C *τοῦτ' αὖ μηδέποτε ἐπὶ φαυλότερον ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον ἴσχειν τοῦ ἐπιόντος ἀεὶ χρόνου*. Ficino: "quod non ad peius sed ad melius futuro semper tempore progrediatur." The Arm. = "et hoc quidem non aliquando ad peius sed ad melius progredi pergente tempore." Clearly he read *ἐπιόντος ἀεὶ τοῦ χρόνου* and omitted *τοῦ* before *ἐπιόντος*. The resemblance between Ficino and the Version suggests, furthermore, that they both had another reading than *ἴσχειν*.

\*769 C *καταλείψει διάδοχον*. The Arm. = *καταδείξει διάδ.*

769 C. Before *ἐπανορθοῦντε* the Arm. had *τοῦ*, read in the Paris

Codex, or perhaps  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ , but not  $\delta\varsigma$ , conjectured by Stephanus, following Ficino: "qui si quid . . . possit."

769 E. Before  $\xi\rho\gamma\omega$  the Arm. has  $\tau\acute{o}\upsilon\tau\omicron$  or  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\alpha$ , where the Paris Codex has  $\tau\acute{o}\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$ , which is impossible. Then in next line  $\tau\iota\nu\grave{\alpha}$ , with the same codex, instead of  $\tau\iota\nu\alpha$ . \*In the same line, for  $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\iota\zeta\omicron\nu\alpha$   $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\epsilon$  the Arm. has  $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\iota\zeta\omicron\nu\alpha$   $\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\iota$   $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\epsilon$ .

770 A. For  $\eta\rho\eta\nu\alpha\iota$  the Arm. has  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\eta\nu\alpha\iota$ . So the Aldine and certain other editions. But Ficino: "creati sunt."

770 D. The Version adheres to  $\tau\epsilon\tau\alpha\gamma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$ , the reading of the Paris MS, instead of  $\tau\epsilon\tau\alpha\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$ , suggested to Stephanus by the rendering of Ficino: "quisque per totam vitam omni studio tendat." In the difficult passage which follows, the Version exactly reflects the Paris MS.

771 B. The Arm. has  $\phi\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\iota$   $\xi\chi\epsilon\iota$   $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ .

771 C. After  $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  the Arm. reads  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  instead of  $\delta\eta$ .

771 D  $\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\tau\tilde{\omega}$   $\tau\tilde{\omega}$   $\tau\eta\varsigma$   $\pi\acute{o}\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma$   $\delta\iota\alpha\mu\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\mu\tilde{\omega}$ . The Arm. omits  $\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\tau\tilde{\omega}$ , as does Ficino.

\*771 E  $\pi\alpha\rho'$   $\acute{\omega}\nu$   $\tau\acute{\epsilon}$   $\tau\iota\varsigma$   $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\acute{\alpha}$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\omicron\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ . For  $\acute{\alpha}$  Ast conjectured  $\eta\nu$ , following Ficino: "cui collocat et quam et a quibus." The Arm. omits  $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\acute{\alpha}$ , so that his Greek text was probably without it.

772 A. The Arm. omits  $\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}$   $\tau\grave{\alpha}$   $\tau\omicron\iota\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\tau\alpha$   $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha$ .

\*772 B  $\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma$   $\acute{\alpha}\nu$   $\delta\rho\omicron\varsigma$   $\iota\kappa\alpha\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$ . The Arm. adds  $\acute{o}$  before  $\delta\rho\omicron\varsigma$ . In next sentence it has  $\chi\rho\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ , the marginal reading of the Paris MS.

772 B  $\delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha\epsilon\tau\eta\rho\iota\varsigma$   $\theta\upsilon\sigma\iota\acute{\omega}\nu$   $\tau\epsilon$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\chi\omicron\rho\epsilon\iota\acute{\omega}\nu$ . The Arm. has  $\theta\upsilon\sigma\iota\acute{\alpha}$  for  $\theta\upsilon\sigma\iota\acute{\omega}\nu$ , but otherwise reflects the Paris text.

772 D  $\tau\acute{o}\nu$   $\kappa\omega\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\nu\omicron\nu\tau\alpha$   $\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\iota$ . For  $\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\iota$  the Version implies  $\tau\grave{\alpha}$   $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\nu\tau\alpha$  or  $\tau\grave{\alpha}$   $\sigma\upsilon\mu\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\nu\tau\alpha$ , but ? sense.

772 E  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$   $\epsilon\nu\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ . The Arm. has  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$  for  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ , with the Paris MS, but \* in the same clause it has  $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$  where the MS has  $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$ . Schanz adopts  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$  from the Apogr. Vatic. and  $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$  conjecturally.

\*773 C  $\acute{\alpha}\nu$   $\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\alpha\iota$ . The Arm. had either  $\acute{\alpha}\nu$   $\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\alpha\iota$  or  $\acute{\alpha}\nu$   $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\alpha\iota$ . The Paris MS has simply  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\alpha\iota$ .

773 E. The Version follows the Paris Codex in reading  $\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$  instead of  $\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$  before  $\tau\eta\varsigma$   $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$   $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\mu\omega\nu$ , but in same line \* has  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\lambda\eta\sigma\tau\omicron\nu$ , which is right, instead of  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\lambda\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\nu$ . Just below it again agrees with the MS in \* reading  $\beta\iota\alpha\zeta\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu$ , against  $\beta\iota\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ , which Schanz conjectures.

\*774 B  $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\nu$   $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\chi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omega$   $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ . The Arm. has  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota$ , so substantiating Hermann's conjecture. Ficino, however, read  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ : "atque huius rationem referre quisque debeat."

774 D  $\acute{o}\phi\epsilon\iota\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omega$   $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$   $\tau\tilde{\omega}$   $\delta\eta\mu\omicron\sigma\acute{\iota}\tilde{\omega}$ . This reading is given in a later

hand in the margin of the Paris MS, which in its text has ὀφλήσει ὀφειλέτω μὲν τῷ Διί. The latter, except for omission of ὀφλήσει, was the Armenian's reading. Ficino renders *aerario*.

774 D. For πεντήκοντα the Arm. has ἐξήκοντα.

774 E πατὴρ μὲν πρῶτην. This is the conjecture of Stephanus. The Paris MS has πρῶτον. So also the Armenian and Ficino: "primum patris."

\*775 B τῷ δ' ἡμισυ τοῦ τοσούτου. The Arm. has τῷ δ' ἡμίσει ἡμισυ τ. τοσ. Ficino follows the Paris MS: "alius semiminam."

775 C καὶ πρὸς τοῦτοις. The Arm. = "et propter haec." Ficino gives a kindred sense: "quare ut solidus, stabilis et quietus conceptus fiat, non oportet corporibus ebrietate diffusis dare operam liberis."

\*775 C ἡσυχαιὸν τε ἐν μοίρᾳ. The Arm. read ἡσυχαιά τε ἐν μ.

775 D. The Armenian Version adds τῶν τοιούτων after νοσῶδη.

775 E ἀρχὴ γὰρ [καὶ θεός] ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἰδρυμένη σφίξει πάντα. Schanz brackets καὶ θεός and Ast conjectured ὥς for καὶ. The Arm. renders in following sense: "initium enim deus quum sit hominibus [or hominum] servat omnia," as if he had read ἀρχὴ γὰρ θεός ὡν ἀνθρώποις σ. π., omitting ἰδρυμένη.

\*775 E νομίσαντα δ' εἶναι χρὴ τὸν γαμοῦντα τοῖν οἰκίαν τοῖν ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ τὴν ἑτέραν οἶον νεοττῶν ἐγγέννησιν καὶ τροφήν. ἐγγέννησιν seems to be wrong in this passage; for—1. it is ἀπαξ λεγόμενον and occurs elsewhere neither in Plato nor in all Greek literature; 2. it can hardly have the sense of 'birth-place,' which Liddell and Scott give to it; on the other hand, the sense *procreatio*, by which Ast (Lex. Platonicum) renders it, is impossible here, for how can an οἰκία be a *procreatio*? 3. Schanz notes of the Paris Codex: "versui ἑτέραν—ἐγγέννη]σιν vitii nota adscripta." The Latin and Armenian versions agree in rendering οἶον—τροφήν thus: "quasi ad pullorum generationem educationemque" (the words are Ficino's, but they exactly convey the Armenian also). Therefore, for ἐγγέννησιν read εἰς γέννησιν. Ficino renders νομίσαντα δ' εἶναι χρὴ by "oportet autem . . . sponsum accipere."

776 A καὶ τὴν οἴκησιν καὶ τὴν τροφήν. The Arm. omits κ. τ. οἴκησιν, Ficino κ. τ. τροφήν.

\*776 E τῷ γένει. The Arm. has τοῦτῳ τῷ γένει, which was conjectured by Ast. Ficino has: "servorum generi," which led Stallbaum to conjecture τῶν δούλων τῷ γένει.

777 E δούλους δεῖ. Athenaeus and Stobaeus read δεῖ. The Paris MS has δ' αἰεῖ. The Arm. = αἰεῖ without δ'.

777 B δῆλον ὥς ἐπειδὴ κ. τ. λ. The Armenian departs more than is usual from its customary literalness, and renders in the following sense: ἐπειδὴ δῆλον ὥς δύσκολόν ἐστι θρέμμα ὁ ἄνθρωπος πρὸς τὸ εἰθίσθαι κατὰ τὴν ἀναγκαίαν διόρισιν, τὸ δοῦλον δὲ ἔργῳ διορίζεσθαι καὶ ἐλεύθερον καὶ δεσπότην οὐδαμῶς εὐχρηστον (? εὐθικτον) ἐθέλειν κ. τ. λ. The Paris Codex has ἐθέλειν.

\*777 C περιδίνων. The Arm. renders πειρατῶν, which is in the margin of the Paris MS and is rendered also by Ficino.

777 E ἐπίταξι. The Arm. = ἐπιτάξει. Ficino: "imperium."

778 A μηδαμῶς οἰκέταις. The Arm. omits οἰκέταις. So perhaps Ficino: "neque iocus ullus cum ipsis, seu feminis seu masculis habeatur."

\*778 D τὰ δὲ καὶ τοιούτων. The Arm. renders καὶ as if it were ὥς. So also Ficino: "partim quidem tanquam de rebus sacris iudicaturi, partim vero tanquam iudicantium Deorum ibi sint delutra."

779 B ἕως ἂν μένῃ. The Arm. has μὲν ἦ, with the Paris MS.

779 D ἐπινομοθετούντων. The Arm. renders as if νομοθετούντων or ἐπινουθετούντων.

\*780 A ὅσον ἀνάγκη. The Arm. omits these words. Ast would read ὅσον μὴ ἂν.

780 C τὸ νόμιμον καὶ κατέστη δῆ. The Arm. = ὁ καὶ κατέστη δῆ.

\*780 C ὀλίγον τε ποιοῦν. The Arm. = ὀλίγον τι ποιοῦν. Badham would omit τε. Just below the Arm. has ποιοῦν τα, with the Paris MS, where Schanz adopts Ast's conjecture, ποιοῦντα.

780 D οὐ δὴ καὶ νῦν ἐφέστηκεν περί. The Arm. takes περί either before or immediately after οὐ.

\*780 E ὅπερ εἶπον is read by the Armenian. The Paris MS is corrupt here and has ἡπόρει. A very late hand adds εἶπον in the margin, and Schanz adopts this reading.

781 A ἀλλ' ὁ καὶ ἄλλως γένος. Here the Paris MS has ἄλλο for ἀλλ' ὁ. The Arm. also has ἄλλο, but adds ὁ immediately after, before λαθραιότερον.

781 C δεδυκός. The Arm. = ignavia, which points to the reading δεδοικός given marginally in the Paris MS. \*In the same section the Arm. has ὅπερ εἶπον, which Schanz reads for οἷπερ, read in the Paris MS.

781 D εἰάν ὑμῖν. The Arm. reads ἡμῖν.

\*781 E τοσούτον χρεῶν. Here the Paris MS has the impossible reading χρόνον for χρεῶν. The Arm. = χρεῶν or χρή, which is added in the margin of the Paris MS.

\*782 D ἀ[τ]' εἶρηκας. The Arm. = ἀτινα εἶρηκας. Winckelmann conjectures ἀττ'. Schanz, following Bekker, "delevit τ'."

783 B-D. From *παίδων δὲ δὴ γένεσιν* down to *τὰ νῦν διακελευει* is omitted in the Armenian.

784 C *δέκα τῶν νομοφυλάκων ἐλομένους, οἷς ἂν ἐπιτρέψωσιν οἷδε [τάξωσι], τούτοις ἐμμένειν*. The general sense is clear—namely, that the parties who desire a divorce are in certain cases to choose ten of the law-guardians as referees and abide by their decision. The Paris MS has *τάξουσι*, but *ου* in *rasura*. "Delevit Hermann." Winckelmann conjectures *ἀ οἷς . . . τάξουσι*. The readings which the Armenian translator and Ficino had are not clearly definable; but the Arm. probably had the same text as we have in the Paris MS. I would suggest *ἐπιτρέψασιν οἷδε τάξωσιν* as the true reading. The sense will then be: 'they shall choose ten of the guardians and abide by that course, whatever these (guardians) ordain to the parties who referred to them.' *οἷς* is attracted into the case of *τούτοις*, its antecedent; but it should be *ἀ* and depend on *τάξωσι*. *ἐπιτρέπειν* is usual in the sense of to refer an issue to a judge or arbitrator. Cp. Laws 946 and 936 A.

\*784 D *τῶνδε· μήτε γάρ*. The Arm. omits *τῶνδε* and *γάρ*. So does Ficino. The joint omission can hardly be accidental.

\*784 D *γενέσεις τῶν παίδων*. So the Armenian, confirming Hermann's conjecture. The Paris Codex has *γενέσε . . . ων*.

784 E. The Armenian renders as if the Greek ran: *ἐὰν ἀλλότριός τις περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα κοινωνῇ ἀλλοτρίᾳ γυναικί*.

785 A *τότε τεθέντας*. The Arm. and Ficino omit *τότε*. Just below the Arm. omits *ὥς* and has *παραγεγράφθω*, with the Paris MS, where Orelli conjectures *παραγεγράφθαι*.

F. C. CONYBEARE.

### III.—THE *ie*-SOUND IN ACCENTED SYLLABLES IN ENGLISH.

There were, as is well known, two distinct sounds of long *e* in Anglo-Saxon, and these two sounds continued in Middle English. That these two sounds of *ē* were quite clearly differentiated during the entire Middle English period, and that not until Modern English times were they confused under the common phonetic *z*-sound, are facts equally well known. The graphic representation of the two sounds in question did, however, differ in Anglo-Saxon times, but in Middle English times the difference is not so clearly indicated by the symbols employed. For example, in early Middle English, in the Southern and Kentish dialects the open *ē* (*ĕ*) was graphically represented by *ea*, as a rule, occasionally by *e*, and the close *ē* by *eo* and *e*; in the Midland dialects, the open *ē* by *æ* and *ea* generally and by *e* occasionally, the close *ē* by *eo* and *e*, while in the Northern dialect no distinction in writing was made between the open and close *ē*, both being represented by *e* and *ee* indifferently. It ought perhaps to be said, however, that the Kentish was more tenacious of the old diphthongs than the Southern dialect was, and so preserved them much more faithfully. In late Middle English, as, for example, the dialect of Chaucer, we find generally the simplified forms used, *e*, *ee*; and occasionally *ie* for the close *ē* occurs, and *ea*, though very rarely, for the open *ē*. Later, about the 16th century, an attempt was made to distinguish in writing between the open and close *ē*'s, which in late Middle English were of course much confused in writing, and so *ee* came to be restricted to the representation of the old close *ē*, while *ea* (a traditional Southern spelling) was used to represent the open sound. This is the rule, to which there are of course exceptions. Witness the following: *dear*, from AS. *dēor* (close diphthong); *dreary*, from AS. *drēorig*; Palsgrave's<sup>1</sup> *beere* (= Mod. English *bier*), from AS. *bār*; Palsgrave's *leed* (= Mod. English *lead*), from AS. *lēad*; Palsgrave's *heed* (= Mod. English *head*), from AS. *hēafod*, etc.

<sup>1</sup> Palsgrave was one of the early orthographists. Cf. Ellis, *Early English Pronunciation*, I, p. 77.

Now, in addition to the symbol *ee* used to represent the close *ē*-sound, still another occurred sporadically, viz. *ie*, which survives in a goodly number of words in present English, as *achieve*, *achievement*, *believe*, *belief*, *bier*, *biestings*, *brief*, *ciel*, *chief* (and its compounds), *fief*, *field*, *fierce* (and its compounds), *fiend*, *friend*, *grief*, *grieve*, *lief*, *liege*, *piece*, *pier*, *pierce*, *priest*, *relief*, *relieve*, *reprieve*, *shield*, *shriek*, *siege*, *sieve*, *tierce*, *wield*, *yield*, etc. The object of this paper is to investigate the origin and history of this graphic representative of the close *ē*-sound in accented syllables.

The origin of the sound denoted by the symbol *ie* must be considered first of all. We know that there existed in Anglo-Saxon the two diphthongs *ie* and *ȳe*, of which, like all AS. diphthongs, the first element bore the stress. Now, these diphthongs are unlike the AS. diphthongs *ēa* and *ēo* in that the latter have correspondents in the Primitive Germanic *au* and *eu*, while *ie* and *ȳe* have no such correspondents, but have their origin in Anglo-Saxon. They have therefore arisen from the phonetic laws which were operative in early Anglo-Saxon. In fact, both of the diphthongs in question are really characteristic peculiarities of a certain dialect of Anglo-Saxon, viz. early West Saxon. In the regular WS. texts *ȳe* and *ie* are of rather rare occurrence, having been replaced at an early period by unstable *ī* and *i*, which in turn were replaced later by *ȳ* and *y*. These last are characteristic peculiarities of late West Saxon. Cf. Sievers' Grammar of Old English, trans. by Cook, §41. But notwithstanding the fact that *ȳe* and *ie* are peculiar to West Saxon, they yet occur sporadically elsewhere, as, for instance, in the Epinal and Cambridge Glosses: *fierst*, *orfiermae*, *georwierdid*, *hunhierī*, *aliesat*, *ȳiendi*. See Sweet's Oldest English Texts, p. 496, where these forms are collected, with references to the glosses contained in the same text. Compare further F. Dieter, Ueber Sprache und Mundart der ältesten englischen Denkmäler, der Epinaler und Cambridge Glossen, §§24, 26.

A.—Short *ie* in Anglo-Saxon arose from the following sources (Sievers' Grammar, §42):

1. From the *i*-umlaut of *ea*, the breaking of Germanic *a*: *bieldo* 'boldness,' from AS. *beald*, cf. OHG. *bald*, *bēldz*; *cwielman* 'to kill, to torture,' from AS. *cwealm*, cf. OS. *quelmian*, *qualm*; *dierne* 'hidden,' cf. AS. *dearnunga*, OS. *derni*, OHG. *tarni*;

*iergðo* 'laziness,' from AS. *earg* + suffix *iþō*, cf. OHG. *arg*; *ierm-ing* 'wretch,' *iermðu* 'misery,' from AS. *earm* + *iþō* (Kluge, N. S. §122); *ieldra*, *ieldesta* 'older, oldest,' *ieldu* 'age,' all from AS. *eald* 'old'; *hliehhan* 'to laugh,' cf. Goth. *hlahjan*, OHG. *hlahhan*; *sliht* 'battle' (*i*-stem), cf. the form *sleaht*, OHG. *slahtha*; *wielisc* 'foreign,' from AS. *wealh*, cf. OHG. *walhisc*, *walh*. So likewise 3d sing. *wiexð*, *slihð*, *ðwiehð*, *wielð*, etc., from *weaxan*, *slean*, *ðwean*, *weallan*, etc.

2. From the *i*-umlaut of *eo*, breaking of Germ. *e*: *afierran* 'to remove,' from AS. *feorr*, cf. OS. *ferr*, OHG. *fairra*; *hierde* 'herdsman' (*jo*-stem), from AS. *heord*, cf. OHG. *herla*, Goth. *hairda*; *ierre* 'angry' (*jo*-stem), cf. OHG. *irri*, Goth. *airzeis* 'astray'; *fierst* 'time,' with metathesis of *r*, from *frist*, cf. OS., OHG. *frist*; *liehtan* 'to make light, to lighten,' from *leoht*, *liht*, cf. Goth. *leihts*; *wierðe* 'worthy,' from AS. *weorð*, cf. OHG. *werd*, Goth. *wairþs*; *wiercan* 'to work,' from AS. *weorc*, cf. OS. *werk*, Goth. *waurkjan*. So belongs here the comp. *wiersa* 'worse,' cf. Goth. *wairsiza*.

3. From the *i*-umlaut of *ea* after palatals: *ciefes* 'concubine,' from *\*ceafis*, *\*cæfis*, cf. OHG. *kebisa*; *ciele* 'cold,' from *\*ceali*, *\*cæli*, cf. Goth. *kalds*; *giest* 'guest,' from *\*geasti* (*i*-stem), *\*gæsti*, cf. Goth. *gasts*; *scieppan* 'to create,' from *\*sceappjan* for *\*scæppjan*, cf. Goth. *skapjan*. So, also, *cietel* 'kettle,' *sciell* 'shell,' belong here.

4. From *e*, Germ. *e*, after palatals, as *sc'*, *c'*, *g'*: *giefan* 'to give,' *giefu* 'gift,' from *\*gefan*, *\*gefu*, cf. OHG. *geban*, *geba*; *giellan* 'to yell,' from *\*gellan*, cf. OHG. *gellan*; *gieldan* 'to yield,' *giæld* 'offering,' from *\*geldan*, cf. OS. *geldan*, *geld*; *scieran* 'to cut,' from *\*sceran*, cf. OHG. *sceran*. So belong here *gietan* 'to obtain,' *gielp* 'boasting,' *gielpān* 'to boast,' *gied* 'song,' *sciæld* 'shield,' etc., from *\*getan*, *\*gelpan*, *\*ged*, *\*scæld*, etc.

5. From palatal umlaut of *eo*, the breaking of Germ. *e* before *h* + consonant: *cnieht* 'servant,' from older *cneoht*, cf. OHG. *kneht*; *riht* 'right,' from older *reoht*, cf. OHG. *reht*; *siex* 'six,' from older *seox*, cf. OHG. *sehs*; *wriexl* 'change,' from older *wreoxl*.

6. From a rare form of the *o*, *u*-umlaut of *i*: *siendum*, pl. of verb *bēon* 'to be,' regular form *sind*; *ðiessum*, dat. of pronoun *ðēs* 'this,' usual form *ðissum*.

It will be seen, therefore, that *ie* does not represent an original Germanic diphthong, but has its origin entirely in Anglo-Saxon.

It has been produced mostly by umlaut and the influence of palatals, and the original vowels which, under the operation of these phonological laws in Anglo-Saxon, have generally given rise to *ie* are Germ. *e* and *a*.

*B.*—Long *ie* in Anglo-Saxon arose from the following sources:

1. From the *i*-umlaut of *ea*, which represents Primitive Germanic *au*, the open diphthong; *biecnan* 'to beckon,' from substantive *bēacen*; *bietel* 'beetle, mall,' from *\*bēatil*, cf. AS. *bēatan*; *diegel* 'secret,' *diegelness*, *diegellice*, etc., cf. OHG. *tougali*; *gēiefan* 'to believe,' AS. *gelēafa*, cf. Goth. *galaubjan*; *hiehest* 'highest,' superl. of *hēah*, Goth. *hauhs* (so *hiera*, comp.); *hieran* 'to hear,' cf. Goth. *hausjan*; *lieg* 'flame' (*i*-stem), cf. OHG. *loug*; *nieten* 'small animal,' from *nēat* 'cattle' (for diminutive suffix *-ina* see Kluge, N. S., §57); *nied* 'need' (*i*-stem), cf. Goth. *naups*, ON. *nauð(r)*; *iewan* 'to show,' beside *ēawan*, cf. Goth. *augjan*, *augō*. Of course the 3d sing. of the ablaut verbs *hēawan*, *hlēapan*, *bēatan* etc., *hiewð* etc., belong here.

2. From the *i*-umlaut of *eo*, which represents Primitive Germanic *eu*, the close diphthong: *strienan* 'to obtain,' from *gestrion* 'possession,' cf. OHG. *gistriunen*; *getrēwe* 'faithful, true,' from *trēow* 'faith'; *ðiestre* 'gloomy,' from *ðeostru*, *ðeostor* 'darkness,' cf. OS. *thiustri*; *liehtan* 'to illuminate,' from *leoht* 'light' (see Sievers' Gr., §100). Also belong here theoretically the 3d sing. of verbs of ablaut class II, as *cīest*, from *cēosan*, etc., etc.

NOTE.—The *ie* in *friend*, *fiend*, dat., nom. pl. of *frēond*, *fēond*, represents the *i*-umlaut of an *eo* which is the result of contraction; cf. Sievers' Gram., §114.

The *ie* in *ciese* has arisen from *i*-umlaut of *ea*, developed from *ē*, Lat. *ā*, through the influence of the palatal *c*, thus: *ciese*, from *\*cēasi*, from *\*cāsi*, from Vulg. Lat. *cāsius*. Cf. Sievers' Gram., §75, 2; Kluge, Paul's Grundriss, I, p. 309; Pogatscher, Zur Lautlehre der griechischen, lateinischen und romanischen Lehnworte im Altenglischen, Quellen und Forschungen, 64, p. 212.

Sporadically *ie* occurs for Germ. *i*, as in *īedel*, *onhrīene*, *rīece*, *īema*, etc., for regular *īdel*, *onhrīne*, *rīce*, *tīma*, etc. Cf. Cosijn, Altwestsächsische Grammatik, §70.

It will be readily observed that *ie*, like *ie*, does not represent an original Germanic diphthong, but has arisen solely from the

operation of the laws of Anglo-Saxon phonology. This diphthong has even fewer sources than the short *ie* has. The principal law or process that has operated to give rise to *ie* is *i*-umlaut. The two sounds which by this process of umlaut have produced *ie* are the AS. open and close diphthongs *ea* (= Germ. *au*) and *eo* (= Germ. *eu*).

As to the quality of the diphthong *ie*, it is difficult to say just what its phonetic value was. Of course, it is well known that this early WS. diphthong appeared in non-WS. texts as *ē*, a close vowel, and that even in late WS. it was reduced to a monophthong. According to Sweet, *History of English Sounds*, §474, this monophthong was an open sound. It does not, however, seem perfectly clear that in all cases this sound was open. At all events, surely the *ie* arising from the *i*-umlaut of the diphthong *eo* was not originally an open sound, for the diphthong *eo* was certainly close (the *ē* being Sweet's mid-front-narrow, long), and the *i* was also close (Sweet's high-front-narrow), and from the very nature of umlaut, being as it is a kind of imperfect assimilation, an open sound could hardly have resulted. It is to be borne in mind, of course, that the AS. diphthongs were all falling diphthongs—that is, the stress fell on the first element and not on the second—a fact which would speak for the close quality of the diphthong in question. If, however, we should grant that an open sound resulted from the *i*-umlaut of *eo*, we must assume that in its subsequent development it was narrowed, because it was later reduced to a monophthong represented first by *ī* and then by *ȳ*, both close sounds. There was probably a difference between the pure AS. *ī*-sound and the so-called unstable *ī*-sound, and if with Sweet we assume the regular AS. *ī* to have been close, the unstable *ī* arising from the monophthonging of *ie* was perhaps somewhat rounded. The fact, too, that *ie* as a rule gave rise to a close sound in Middle English is presumptive evidence for close quality in Anglo-Saxon. The *ie* arising from AS. *ea*, open diphthong, may have been open originally. But since two *ie*-sounds cannot be demonstrated for Anglo-Saxon, we must assume that the *ie* from *eo*, and the *ie* from *ea*, were of the same quality in West Saxon. What has been said of *ie* applies equally well also to *ie*.

In Middle English the problem before us assumes a different aspect. We here have to deal with the question of French influence in the history of *ie*. Under the general tendency of all

AS. diphthongs towards simplification in Middle English, the few WS. *ie*-diphthongs that remained would naturally be reduced to monophthongs, so that one might expect this to be the end of *ie*. But such is not the case. As a matter of fact, *ie* occurs with comparative frequency in one of the Middle English dialects, the Kentish, and often with the apparent value of close *ē*. The Kentish, it will be remembered, unlike the other ME. dialects, generally preserved the old AS. diphthongs. Now, we know that the old Kentish dialect did not exhibit the diphthongs *ie* and *īe*, so that the *ie* which occurs in this dialect in Middle English must be traced to another source. In a word, then, the AS. (WS.) *īe*, *ie* were simplified into *ī*, *i*, which later were represented by *ȳ*, *y*, and here the old WS. diphthongs *īe*, *ie* end. But this same symbol is found in Middle English, where, however, it is used to represent the AS. close *ēo* generally, and occasionally other sounds. In Middle English in general it has the value of a monophthong.

In order to show more clearly the sphere and use of this *ie* in Middle English, I have examined representative texts of the several ME. dialects, the results of which examination now follow.

#### *Kentish Dialect.*

In the early Kentish, especially in the Kentish sermons,<sup>1</sup> occur the following forms in which *ie* represents AS. *ēo*: *bien* (AS. *bēon* 'to be'), pp. 26, 33; *bieð* (plural), pp. 28, 31, 32, 35, 36, etc.; *biedh* (idem), p. 31; *bie*, pp. 31, 34, etc.; *dieule* (AS. *dēofol* 'devil'), p. 28; *forbiet* (AS. *forbēot*), p. 32; *niedes*, *nyede* (AS. *nēod* 'need,' WS. *nīed*), p. 32, etc.

In the later Kentish, especially in the Ayenbite of Inwyt, occur the following forms: *viend* (AS. *fēond* 'enemy'), p. 158; *hier* (AS. *hēr* 'here'), pp. 146, 150, 160, etc.; *febleness* (OFr. *fioble* 'feeble,' Anglo-Norman *feble*), pp. 148, 157, etc.; *niede* (AS. *nēod*, WS. *nīed*), pp. 142, 149, 155, 164, etc.; *niedvoll*, p. 151; *dyep-nesse* (AS. *dēop* 'deep'), pp. 105, 211; *dyepe*, p. 211, etc.; *piestre* (AS. *ðēostre* 'dark,' WS. *ðīestre*), p. 159; *piesternesse*, p. 201; *piesterliche*, p. 244; *piefðe* (AS. *ðēof* 'thief'), pp. 9, 38, 192; *tiene* (AS. *tēon* 'anger'), pp. 31, 66, 124, etc.; *pyeve* (pl. *pyeves*), pp. 37, 263; *wyefde* (AS. *wēofod* 'altar'), pp. 14, 236, etc.; *wryeð* (AS. *wrēon* 'to cover'), pp. 61, 175; *hiere*, *hyere* (AS. *hēran*, WS.

<sup>1</sup> Old English Miscellany, ed. by R. Morris, E. E. T. S. 1872.

*hieran* 'to hear'), pp. 20, 54, 72, 122, 209, 210, 257, etc.; *chiere* (OFr. *chere*, *chiere* 'cheer'), pp. 155, 193; *chiese* (AS. *cēosan* 'to choose'), pp. 45, 86, 93, 101, etc.; *chiewe* (AS. *cēowan* 'to chew'), p. 111; *clier*, *clierliche*, etc. (OFr. *cler* 'clear'), pp. 24, 78, 88, 104, 155, 159, 167, 174, 243, etc.; *dyere* (AS. *dēor* 'dear'), pp. 36, 68, 79, 123, 133, 194, etc.; *liese* (AS. *forlēosan* 'to lose'), p. 214; *lierne*, *lierni* (AS. *leornan*, late WS. *lēornan* 'to learn'), pp. 73, 209; *zyeð*, *sieð*, etc. (AS. *sēon* 'to see'), pp. 16, 150, 231, 244, etc. So also *lief* (AS. *lēof*), *grief* (OFr. *grefe*, *grief*), *siege* (OFr. *siege*), etc.

It is very obvious that the Kentish *ie*, as the above list shows, represents in most cases AS. *ēo*, occasionally AS. *ē* (WS. *ie*), and often OFr. *ie* or *e*, all of which in Middle English are close sounds. The quality of this *ie* in Kentish seems therefore close.

#### *Southern Dialect.*

In this dialect the text examined was the Ancren Riwe. The *ie* was found to occur very rarely. Examples are; *wrien* (AS. *wrēon* 'to cover'), pp. 58, 84, 86; *unwrien*, p. 328; *iwrien*, p. 388; *drien* (AS. *drēogan* 'to endure'), pp. 80, 112, 134, 348, 358, 376, 430; *hien* (AS. *higian* 'to hasten'), pp. 92, 326, 368; *lien* (AS. *licgan* 'to lie'), p. 290; *wieles* (AS. *wīgel* 'deceit'), pp. 92, 224, 268; *wielare* ('deceiver'), p. 106; *stien* (AS. *stīgan*), pp. 356, 362, 400; *nie*, *niepe* (AS. *nīgeðe* 'ninth'), pp. 9, 198, 236. So *twies*, pp. 70, 324; *pries*, p. 324; *aspieden* (OFr. *espier* 'to lie in wait'), p. 196; *crie* (Fr. *crier* 'to cry'), p. 136; *diete* (Fr. *diet*), p. 112.

This *ie* is of a different character from that already discussed which occurs in Kentish. This *ie* is really, in most cases, *i+e*; that is to say, the *e* is no part of a diphthong, but is simply the *e* of the final syllable, and the *i* represents AS. *i*. So, then, we may say that the early Southern dialect does not exhibit *ie* as a representative of the AS. *ēo*, or *ē*, or of the Old French diphthong *ie*. The absence of *ie* as representing the OFr. diphthong *ie* is very remarkable, inasmuch as French influence is so very patent in the spelling of the Ancren Riwe.

#### *East Midland Dialect.*

The text examined in this dialect was of course the Ormulum, and, strange to say, it exhibits no cases of *ie*. The AS. *ēo* is here preserved in the unsimplified form, or is represented by the simplified *e*.

*West Midland Dialect.*

This dialect stands about on the same footing as the East Midland in regard to *ie*. Layamon, the text used, exhibits few or no cases of *ie* for AS. *eo*, or the OFr. diphthong *ie*. Two or three cases of *ie* were found, as *biere* (= *bore*, past tense of *bear*), B, p. 106; *cwiene* (= *queen*), B, l. 4379; but since both of these occur in the later MS, which is confessedly corrupt, we may say that the West Midland dialect does not exhibit *ie*.

*Northern Dialect.*

The texts examined in this dialect are not coeval with those examined in the other dialects. They are of a later date. One of these, the Cursor Mundi, exhibits no cases of *ie* except a very few unsatisfactory cases, such as *ie* in *Gabriel*, *lien*, *pier* (= *their*), l. 5938, and *squier*, ll. 7717, 7763. Instead of *ie* the Cursor Mundi, especially the Cotton and Goettingen MSS, often exhibits *ei*, which sometimes appears to be used where we should expect *ie*. Examples are: *yeir* (C.), ll. 6893, 6917; *beist* (C.), l. 6781; *preist* (G.), ll. 6805, 6947; *weild* riming with *yeild* (C.), l. 6741; *feild* riming with *yeild* (C., G.), ll. 6761, 7464; *freind* (G.), ll. 7097, 7101, (C., G.) l. 9651; *weird*, *fleirand*, *yeit*, *biheild*, *eild*, *forleit*, *sceind*, *meind*, *keiser*, etc.

The other text read is Hampole's Pricke of Conscience, which does exhibit a few cases of *ie*. They are as follows: *griefe* riming with *lyfe*, l. 749, riming with *gyfe*, ll. 4260, 6932; *lyefe* riming with *grefe*, l. 4352, with *gryefe*, ll. 4645, 7436, 8153; *mysbelyefe* riming with *griefe*, l. 5520; *gryeved* riming with *lyved*, l. 5615.

These few sporadic occurrences of *ie*, if they are really not due to Southern influence, are entirely insufficient to establish a rule. We may therefore say that *ie* was not used in the Northern dialect.

The result of the foregoing investigation of the several ME. dialects shows, then, quite conclusively that in early Middle English the use of *ie* was confined almost exclusively to the Kentish dialect, where it generally, though not invariably, represented the close *e*-sound. The expression 'early Middle English' is employed advisedly, because in late Middle English the symbol *ie* ceased to be confined to the Kentish and became of quite frequent occurrence elsewhere, as, for example, in the dialect of the Old English Homilies<sup>1</sup> of the 13th century and in Chaucer. The Homilies, which probably belong to the South-

<sup>1</sup> Edited by Richard Morris for the Early English Text Society, 1872.

east Midland and show some Kentish influence, exhibit such forms as the following: *bieð* 'be,' *bien*, *ðiesternesse*, *bihielð*, *giede* 'went,' *pieð* 'thrive,' *hielden*, *criepeð*, *liefe*, *lief*, *dievel*, *hie* 'they,' *rieweð* 'rue,' *forgiet*, *hie* 'she,' *biwiep*, *wiep* 'wept,' *wield*, *gier* 'year,' *gieve*, *nieht*, etc.

To Chaucer, because of his obvious importance in the consideration of the problem before us, and in order to prove clearly the value of this *ie* as phonetic close *i*, it has seemed advisable to give a more detailed consideration. The following result of Chaucer's<sup>1</sup> use of *ie* is therefore given:—

<i>believe</i>	rimes with <i>repreve</i> ; cf. Wyfe of Bathes Tale, l. 322.
<i>matiere</i>	" <i>heere</i> ; cf. Man of Lawes Tale, l. 650.
<i>matiere</i>	" <i>heere</i> ; cf. Clerke of Oxford's Tale, Prol., l. 58.
<i>meschief</i>	" <i>preef</i> ; cf. Prol. Wyfe of Bathes Tale, l. 248.
<i>meschief</i>	" <i>preef</i> ; cf. Prol. Maunciples Tale, l. 77.
<i>meschief</i>	" <i>preef</i> ; cf. Chanounes Yemannes T., l. 368.
<i>hiewe</i>	" <i>trewe</i> ; cf. Freres T., l. 322; Prol. Pard. T., l. 134.
<i>meschief</i>	" <i>greef</i> ; cf. Sompnoures Tale, l. 490.
<i>matiere</i>	" <i>frere</i> ; cf. Sompnoures Tale, ll. 520, 588.
<i>hiere</i>	" <i>cheere</i> ; cf. Clerke of Oxford, Prol., l. 8.
<i>hiere</i>	" <i>cheere</i> ; cf. Prol. Monkes Tale, l. 35.
<i>matiere</i>	" <i>deere</i> ; cf. Clerke Ox. T. II 124; March. T., l. 440.
<i>hiere</i>	" <i>manere</i> , <i>deere</i> ; cf. Clerke Ox. T. II 138, III 141.
<i>matiere</i>	" <i>manere</i> ; cf. Canterbury Tales, end.
<i>squiere</i>	" <i>sopere</i> ; cf. Frank. Tale, l. 473.
<i>hiere</i>	" <i>hecre</i> ; cf. Doctor of Phisikes Tale, l. 176.
<i>matiere</i>	" <i>heere</i> ; cf. Prol. Monk. T., l. 96.
<i>matiere</i>	" <i>heere</i> ; cf. Prol. Pars. T., l. 36.
<i>meschief</i>	" <i>agreef</i> ; cf. Nonne Prest. T., l. 73.
<i>meschief</i>	" <i>theef</i> ; cf. Mauncp. T., l. 130.
<i>piere</i>	" <i>manere</i> ; cf. Prol. Personnes T., l. 68.
<i>achieved</i>	" <i>agreved</i> ; cf. Rom. of Rose, l. 2050.
<i>hiene</i>	" <i>betwene</i> ; cf. Minor Poems, p. 291.
<i>agryefe</i>	" <i>mischief</i> , <i>lief</i> ; cf. Tr. and Cr. IV 583-6.
<i>whiel</i>	" <i>stiel</i> ; cf. Tr. and Cr. IV 295.
<i>lief</i>	" <i>grief</i> ; cf. Tr. and Cr. III 814.
<i>wierdes</i>	" <i>hierdes</i> ; cf. Tr. and Cr. III 570.
<i>stiel</i>	" <i>whiel</i> ; cf. Tr. and Cr. IV 297.
<i>hiere</i>	" <i>chiere</i> ; cf. Frankl. Tale, l. 618.
<i>hiere</i>	" <i>matiere</i> ; cf. Nonne Prest. T., ll. 431, 442.

<sup>1</sup> The edition upon which text this investigation is based is Morris's.

In addition to the above examples of *ie* in rime, some instances of its use in the body of the verse may be cited as showing, not its phonetic quality, but its sphere and source. Examples are: *friend*, *friendly*, cf. Dream, 825, 1075, 1141, 2093, etc.; *shield*, cf. Tr. and Cres. IV 431, Flower and Leaf, 255, etc.; *coverchief*, cf. Wyfe of Bathes T., 162; *frie* (AS. *frēo*), cf. Wyfe of Bathes T., 488; *stiel*, cf. Tr. and Cres. IV 431; *riede*, cf. House of Fame, III 131; *fioble*, cf. Tr. and Cres. V 1222; *lief*, *lieve*, cf. Tr. and Cres. III 596, 820 (see Nonne Prest. T., l. 257, etc.); *chiere*, cf. Clerkes T. III 87; *fiers*, *fiersly*, cf. Tr. and Cres. III 1711, V 1820, etc.; *matier*, cf. March. Tale, l. 273; *chierle*, cf. Frankl. Tale, 153; *grief*, cf. Tr. and Cres., l. 813; *siege*, cf. Dream, l. 457, etc.

Now, first of all it should perhaps be said that *ie* does not occur very frequently in Chaucer, or in any other ME. text, for that matter. The rimes show clearly that Chaucer regarded *ie* merely as the equivalent of close *ē*, and not as a diphthong. The symbol *ie* does not stand for the open *ē*. It is used to represent generally AS. *eo*, as in *friend*, *whiel*, *lief*, etc., or WS. *īe* (non-WS. *ē*), as in *stiel*, *beliefe*, *believe*, *hiere* 'hear,' *hiere* 'here,' *shield*, etc., or OFr. *e* (from Latin *a*), as in *pier*, *clier*, etc.; OFr. *ie* (which in Anglo-Norman was reduced to the monophthong *ē*), as in *chief*, *grief*, *grieve*, *matiere*, *chiere*, etc. Now, all of these correspondents, it is a well-established fact, were close sounds, so that the conclusion is irresistible that *ie* in Chaucer had the phonetic value of close *ē*.

The question now naturally arises, How came it that Chaucer used the symbol with the phonetic value of close *ē* when, as has been shown, Orm., Layamon, and the author of *Ancren Riwe* employed it rarely or not at all? In other words, What is the source of Chaucer's *ie*? Is it due to Kentish influence or to French influence? It has been shown that *ie* occurred very frequently in Kentish, in both early and late Middle English times. In early Kentish *ie* doubtless had the value of a diphthong, but in late Kentish it probably lost this diphthongal quality. The *i* in early Kentish at least seems to have been regarded as a kind of glide which was developed before the old diphthong *eo*, and occasionally even before *ea* and *e*, as in *ihierde*, *hyer*, etc. Sweet: (cf. History of English Sounds, §§659, 683) thinks that this *ie* or *je* points to an intermediate *jæ*. Now, it is quite possible that this *ie* is the source of Chaucer's *ie*. Of course, words introduced at a later date from the French may

very well have reinforced the native stock. When we consider the facts that this *ie* is confined almost exclusively to the Kentish dialect and to that of Chaucer, and that the Ancrén Riwle, which shows a decidedly French coloring in its spelling, exhibits few or no cases of the *ie* (= phonetic *ē*), and that the OFr. diphthong *ie*<sup>1</sup> was gradually during the 12th century reduced to the monophthong *e*,<sup>2</sup> the theory of French influence appears obviously untenable. On the theory of French influence we could explain very well words of French origin exhibiting *ie*, but this theory seems entirely inadequate to the explanation of words of pure English origin, such as *lief*, *friend*, *hier*, *stiel*, *whiel*, *hierd*, *weird*, *belief*, *believe*, *shield*, *wield*, etc. The facts in the case seem, then, to warrant the theory of Kentish influence reinforced by French.

We have thus far shown that the old AS. *ie* was reduced to a monophthong in late West Saxon and early Middle English; that another *ie* arose in the Kentish dialect from the combination of the glide *i* (*j*) with AS. *eo*, *ē*, etc.; that this *ie*, which in late Kentish probably lost its diphthongal quality, must have been extended to the dialect of Chaucer, but only with the value of close *ē*; and that this *ie* was in all probability reinforced by the OFr. *ie* in words introduced from the Continent in late ME. times. It now remains, first, to show somewhat in detail that this occasional way of writing close *ē* continued from the 14th century on and did not fall entirely into disuse, and, secondly, to indicate briefly the subsequent history of this *ie*, which is really identical with that of close *ē*. Attention is drawn to the first point especially, because of what appears to be a somewhat misleading statement occurring in Ellis's Early English Pronunciation (cf. p. 104). He says: "*Ie* in the middle of words was employed in the 14th century indiscriminately with *e* or *ee*, but not very frequently. In the 15th and 16th centuries it had fallen out of use, though we find it fully established with the modern sound of (*ii*) in the 17th century, in which is included also the word *friend*, as already noted (p. 80)." Now, these words are a trifle infelicitous, because the natural inference is that *ie* was

<sup>1</sup> See Schwan, Grammatik des Altfranzösischen,<sup>2</sup> §§76, 91.

<sup>2</sup> See Kluge, Geschichte der englischen Sprache (Pauls Grundriss, I, p. 817, §33); Behrens, Beiträge zur Geschichte der französischen Sprache in England (Französische Studien, V 2), pp. 84, 146 seq.; and A. Sturmfels, Der altfranzösische Vokalismus im Mittlenglischen bis zum Jahre 1400 (Anglia, VIII, p. 201 seq.).

not at all used during the 15th and 16th centuries. It must be borne in mind, of course, that *ie* even in the 14th-century texts never occurred frequently; it was only of sporadic occurrence at best. We cannot, therefore, expect to find it in the 15th and 16th centuries occurring with anything like regularity, for during this period English spelling was in a very chaotic condition; it was entirely unsettled and there was no norm. It was not until the 17th century that English spelling became fixed and crystallized, and then it was that the vacillating *ie* was established. An examination of some of the texts of the period in question, however, warrants the conclusion that *ie* did not fall entirely into disuse, but was employed—though rarely, of course—just as in the 14th century.

For the 15th century the texts examined are: An Old English Chronicle of the Reign of Richard II, Henry IV, Henry V, Henry VI,<sup>1</sup> which was written about 1471, Lydgate, and Caxton's translations. In the former occur such examples of *ie* as the following: *chief*, pp. 22, 28, 42, 48, 66 (year 1441), 65 (year 1450), 80, etc.; *myschief*, pp. 47, 60 (year 1450); *liege*, p. 71 (year 1454); *liegeman*, pp. 82, 86, 98; *relief*, p. 88 (year 1460); *chiefteyne*, p. 43; *chiere* (= *cheer*), p. 41; *pieris* (= *peers*), p. 18; *archiers*, pp. 36, 44, etc.; *matiers*, p. 89; *squier*, pp. 22, 29, 35, 36, 58, 63, 66, 67, 89, 107, etc.; *soudiers*, p. 39; *aliened*, p. 68; *lieutenant*, p. 41, etc. Lydgate and Caxton exhibit likewise such examples as *pyece*, *nyece*, *siege*, *fiersness*, *fyerce*, *fyersly*, *tyerce*, *fliese* (= *fleece*), *chyere* (= *cheer*), *gryeve*, *pyeres* (= *peers*), *myschief*, *prief*, *chief*, *lief*, *stiel*, *wiel*, etc.

For the 16th century all the writers in general were examined, as William Ray, J. Barlow (1528), Surrey, Wiat, Sackville, Udall, Latimer, Roger Ascham, Gosson, Tottel's Miscellany, Spenser, etc. In all of these writers examples of *ie* occur, as *thief*, *priest*, *piece*, *friend*, *fierce*, *field*, *shield*, *chief*, *grief*, *brief*, *relief*, *diep*, *lief*, *chiere*, *lieftenaunt*, *wiers*, *yield*, *wield*, *view*, *believe*, *achieve*, *shriek*, *prief*, *shrieve*, *reprieve*, *prieve*, *liege*, etc. Now, it is to be observed, however, that this spelling is not at all regular, as it was not in the 14th century. It is merely employed as an occasional way of writing close *ē*, except toward the end of the 16th century, when the *ie* in certain words occurs quite regularly. Spenser, for example, writes with remarkable regularity *field*, *shield*, *fierce*, *yield*, *wield*, *grief*, *shriek*, etc. The *ie* in these

<sup>1</sup> Found in the Camden Society Publications, 1856.

words was not, however, fixed till the middle of the next century. Price's writing (1668) shows the *ie* established,<sup>1</sup> which has continued to the present. He writes *believe, besiege, bier, brief, cavalier, cashier, chief*, [*field, fiend, fierce,*] *friend, frontier*, [*grieve*] *kerchief*, [*liefe,*] *liege, niece, piece, pierce, [priest,] [shield,] siege, sieve, thief, view, yield*, etc.

Now, some of these words, such as *niece, piece, tier, fief, siege*, etc., were doubtless influenced by the French, while others, such as *friend, fiend, believe, field, wield, yield*,<sup>2</sup> etc., probably represent the retention of the old traditional Kentish spelling. Such a word as *bier* (cf. AS. *bær*, ME. *bēr*) may have arisen from confusion with the OFr. *biere*, as Sturmfels<sup>3</sup> suggests, somewhat like the Mod. English *hair*, which, according to Luick (cf. *Anglia*, 14, 456), arose from the association of AS. *hær*, ME. *hēr*, with the OFr. *haire*. By the side of *reprieve*, from ME. *reprêve*, from the French, exists the later-formed *reprove*, while the ME. *remève* has been supplanted entirely by the new *remove*. Of course, the word *friend* in early Modern English underwent the process of shortening.

It is quite obvious, then, that *ie* did not fall entirely into disuse during the 15th and 16th centuries. On the contrary, it has been shown that it was of almost as frequent occurrence during this period as in the 14th century, during which time it was merely of sporadic occurrence. A reference to the table subjoined at the end will show this quite clearly.

The *ie* became identified with the close *ē* in Middle English, as was shown, and its subsequent history is identical with that of the latter sound. This close *ē*, which in Middle English had the phonetic value of a long mid-front-narrow vowel, in the latter part of the 15th century or the early part of the 16th was raised, in a few words such as *bee, beere, peere, fee, he, she*,<sup>4</sup> etc., to a very close *i*-like sound, probably the high-front-narrow position.

<sup>1</sup> The writing with *ie* was not established in all the words in which it was of occasional occurrence during the 15th and 16th centuries. Witness, for example, *fliese, pyere* (= *peer*), *stiel* (= *steel*), *chyere* (= *cheer*), etc. Some few words whose prototypes do not belong to this category came to be written with *ie*, as *shriek*, ME. *shriken* < Icel. *skrikja*; *sieve*, ME. *sive, sife* < AS. *sife*. This last word, however, has undergone the process of shortening.

<sup>2</sup> The vowel in these words is entitled to its long quantity by virtue of the process of lengthening before *ld* in Middle English.

<sup>3</sup> See *Anglia*, 8, p. 217.

<sup>4</sup> See Ellis's *Early English Pronunciation*, I, p. 77, Palsgrave (1530).

The Middle English *ī*, which formerly occupied this last-named position, had of course been diphthonged. Later, during the 17th century, *ee* was raised, in all words, to this high-front-narrow *ii* (ME. *ī*). This high-front-narrow value *ee* still continued to retain throughout the 18th century and during the early part of the 19th, when, under the general tendency of all long vowels towards diphthongization, according to Sweet, it became a diphthong (*ij*).<sup>1</sup>

In conclusion I give a brief summary of what I believe to be the result of the foregoing investigation:—

1. The old WS. diphthongs *ie* and *ie*, which in late West Saxon were generally reduced to close monophthongs, did not survive in Middle English.

2. A new *ie*-diphthong arose in early Middle English in the Kentish dialect, which later was reduced to a monophthong. This *ie* was confined in early Middle English almost exclusively to the Kentish, but later was employed by Chaucer and other ME. writers, as an equivalent of the ME. close *ē*-vowel. This native *ie* of Kentish origin was reinforced in late Middle English by French words introduced from the Continent.

3. The *ie* did not fall into disuse during the 15th and 16th centuries, but was used, as in late Middle English, merely as an occasional way of writing close *ē*. About the middle of the 17th century the *ie* became established in those words in which it appears in present English.

4. Being identical with close (*ee*), *ie* at the time of its establishment in the language had the phonetic value of (*ii*)—that is, of a long high-front-narrow vowel. This value it retained till the present century, when, under the general tendency of all long vowels towards diphthongization, it developed into the diphthong (*ij*). *Ie* has therefore returned to something like its primitive diphthongal value.

UNIVERSITY OF LEIPZIG.

EDWIN W. BOWEN.

<sup>1</sup> A detailed proof of the history of the close *ee* in English having been previously given by me, it did not seem advisable to do more than to indicate this, for the sake of completeness, in the above outline sketch.

TABLE SHOWING THE INTRODUCTION AND ESTABLISHMENT OF *ie* FOR CLOSE (*ee*) IN MODERN ENGLISH.

CHAUCER.		15TH CENT. WRITERS.		EARLY 16TH CENT. WRITERS.		SPENSER.		MINSWORTH.		PRICE.	
Usual.	Rate.	Usual.	Rate.	Usual.	Rate.	Usual.	Rate.	1617.	1668.	1668.	1668.
achieve	achieve	achieve		achieve	achieve	achieve	believe	believe		[achieve]	
believe	believe	believe		believe	believe	believe	believe	believe		believe	
bere		beere		beere		bier		beere		bier	
briefe	briefe	briefe	briefe	briefe	brief	brief	breefe	briefe	briefe	brief	
chefe	chiefe	chefe	chiefe	chefe	chief	chief	chefe	chiefe	chiefe	chief	
feelde	felde	felde		felde	field	field	feld	field	field	[field]	
feende	fiende	fiende		fiend	fiend	fiend	fiend	fiend		[fiend]	
fers	ferce	ferce		ferce	fierce	fierce	ferce	fierce		[fierce]	
freende	friende	frende		friend	friend	friend	friend	friend		friend	
greffe	griefe	greve	greyve	greve	grieve	griefe	greve	greve	griefe	grief	
keverchef	coverchief	keverchef	kyrchef	kercher		griefe	greve	kerchiefe		kerchief	
leef (leve)	liif	leve	liege	lefe	liif	liif	leef			[liif]	
[lege]		lege	liege	lege		liege		liege		liege	
necce		necce	nyece		neyce			necce		niece	
pece		pece	pyece	pece		peece	piece	peece		piece	
percen	pierce	perce		perce	pierce	perce	piece	perce		piece	
prest		prest		preest	priest	priest		prieste		[priest]	
relieve		relief	relief	relief		relief				[relief]	
repreve		repreve	prief	repreve	reprieve	reprieve				[reprieve]	
shield	shield	shield	shield	sheeld	shield	shield	shield	sheeld		[shield]	
sege	siege	sege	siege	sege	besege	siege	shield	siege		siege	
theef	thief	thee		theefe	thief	thief	theef	theefe		thief	
welde	wielde	welde		welde	wielde	wield	weld			[wield]	
yelde	yielde	yelde		yelde	yield	yield	yeld	yeeld		yield	

#### IV.—ON THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE LEPTINEAN ORATIONS ATTRIBUTED TO ARISTEIDES.

A little more than one century ago Morelli discovered, in the library at Venice, an oration, concerning which he says in his *Prolegomena*: *Etsi vero inscriptione atque adeo auctoris nomine omnino careat Oratio, Aristidi tamen ut fidenter adjudicari possit, stilus potissimum fecit, Sophistae huic maxime proprius, aliis vero scriptoribus prorsus alienus.* This dictum was never questioned until 1841, when Foss (*commentatio critica, qua probatur declamationes duas Leptineas . . . non esse ab Aristide scriptas, Altenburg*) declared that Morelli was wrong, which conclusion Dr. Schmid, in the second volume of his *Atticismus*<sup>1</sup> (in which he treats of Aristeides) accepts. The object of this paper is to prove that the oration in question (LIV, Dindorf) and its companion (LIII) *were* written by Aristeides.

Dr. Schmid says (p. 52) that Aristeides has very carefully avoided the use of the perfect for the aorist, adding: "ich kann kein einziges Versehen in dieser Beziehung aus echten Reden anführen, und Foss hat vollkommen Recht, wenn er das häufige Vorkommen dieses Fehlers in den zwei leptineischen Reden als einen Beweis dafür hervorhebt dass dieselben nicht von Aristides verfasst seien." But Schmid, in his endeavor to represent Aristeides as conforming almost universally to the Attic norm, makes several statements which do not agree with the facts. For example, on p. 58 he says that constructions with *ὄτι* or *ὥς*, where the infinitive ought to have been used, he has not found in the rhetorician. And yet *φημι ὄτι* occurs at least seven times: Dind. II 439, 503, 508, 509 (bis), 519, 521, and LIV 87.<sup>2</sup> Although Aristeides succeeds tolerably well in his efforts to write like Plato, or Isokrates and Demosthenes, he varies more from the Attic norm than some of Schmid's assertions would lead us to suppose.<sup>3</sup>

It is true that the number of perfects in LIV is very large (191), but there are almost as many in the Leptinea of Demosthenes (155). I do not reckon, of course, the virtual presents. In the

<sup>1</sup> Stuttgart, 1889.

<sup>2</sup> In LIII and LIV I refer to Wolf's sections; elsewhere to Dindorf's pages.

<sup>3</sup> The preposition *σύν* occurs 55 times (not counting such phrases as *σύν θεοῖς*); *κελεύειν* is construed with the dat., Dind. I 498; *μή* for *οὐ* is very common. On *οὐ* for *μή* see below, p. 72.

orator 58 are finite verbs and 66 participles; in the rhetorician 47 finite verbs and 71 participles. It is in the infinitive, then, that the discrepancy exists. The perf. inf. is rare in any construction in classic Greek, but we find in this oration of Demosthenes 31 examples (two articular); in Aristeides there are 25 articular and 48 non-articular. The companion speech contains 26 perf. infinitives with the article. Is it not reasonable, then, to suppose that Aristeides, having observed the abundant use of the perfect in the original (which he had well in his mind's eye, as is attested by word, thought and expression on every page), employed it also, but "sowed with the whole sack"? What if he did not always comprehend the shade of meaning, e. g. the perfects in §§35 and 55? Neither did he comprehend the thought of the classic literature; yet he is constantly busied with it. Nor does the fact that the number of aorists (indic., or equiv., and part.) in Demosthenes (297) greatly exceeds the number in Aristeides (171) affect the question. Even this discrepancy does not appear so great when we take into consideration the fact that the Leptinea of Demosthenes contains about 109 στίχοι more than that of Aristeides, and, further, that if in the Teubner edition of the former we take out six pages<sup>1</sup> (there are about 35 στίχοι to a page), which contain three-eighths of the whole (114), the number will be reduced to 183—only twelve more than we find in Aristeides.

That hiatus was avoided by the author of the orations we are discussing can be seen by the numerous examples of aphaeresis (e. g. LIV 42, 100, 102; LIII 55), many of which also occur throughout the works of Aristeides, although the latter says nothing about the avoidance of hiatus in his treatise on rhetoric. There are about 90 cases of hiatus in LIV; but this number can be reduced at least one-half by elision and other means, showing that the text is in the same condition as in the undisputed works—"im Text des Aristides muss die Elision viel konsequenter durchgeführt werden" (Schmid, p. 253).<sup>2</sup> For the same reason

<sup>1</sup> §§41-48, 52-55, 68-74, 75-86, where the orator recounts the deeds of Epikerdes, the exiles from Corinth, Konon and Chabrias. In §§52-55 there are twenty-one in the compass of a single page.

<sup>2</sup> Schmid's remark, p. 257, that the choice between ὥσπερ and καθάπερ is, as a rule, determined by a regard for the avoidance of hiatus, can hardly be true. In six successive speeches I have noticed that ὥσπερ appears fifty times, καθάπερ only three; Dind. I, p. 68, ὥσπερ three times in five lines; p. 81, three in four lines; p. 38, καθάπερ five times on one page. In classic Greek καθάπερ has a legal coloring, but in the later language largely usurps the place of ὥσπερ. Its use in Aristeides is probably better explained on this basis.

we should not gain much, if we should make an investigation in regard to the observance of the rhythmical law. In 205 instances in LIV the law is disregarded—but one-fourth of these examples could be cancelled. In Demosthenes there are 43 cases, ten of which hardly count.

To turn to the positive side. Even if Aristeides, in his address to Capito (Dind. I 417), does not refer to these orations (LIV and LIII), we have sufficient internal evidence, I think, to show that he was the author. Before Schmid's book appeared, I had written, in my study of the Leptinean orations, this sentence: "Any one who has read Aristeides through can readily agree with Morelli." And one quality which stamps them as Aristeidean is their intolerable jejuneness. But granted that Aristeides is not the only author who can be dry, nevertheless, we find here "nur ein hohles Phrasen-Gebäude," as Baumgart styles it, such as we discover in most of his works, the same imperfect knowledge of ideas and things, the same empty 'word-contest' as in his polemic against Plato's Gorgias, the same sophistic superficiality, rhetorical arbitrariness, vanity, and want of originality. It is as difficult for him to find admirers now as it was to secure pupils in his day. His empty lecture-room, although he would accept no remuneration for his instruction, became proverbial:

*χαίρει Ἀριστείδου τοῦ ῥήτορος ἐπὶ μαθηταί,  
τέσσαρες οἱ τοῖχοι καὶ τρία σνψέλια.*

That an attempt to write a speech which would be superior to Demosthenes' best efforts is in keeping with the character of Aristeides, we know from his own statements.<sup>1</sup> His attitude toward the gods is the same in the orations under discussion<sup>2</sup> as elsewhere. In the fifty-first oration he tells us that he neglects no opportunity to glorify his native city; the same is true of the Leptinea in his character as an Athenian. In or. XLIX he asserts that for a good speech lightness and adroitness are requisite. In his *τέχνη* this statement is repeated. Now, these

<sup>1</sup> Although Ar. disdains the *μελέται* of the ordinary speakers (XLVII 768, 297), yet the five Leuctrici, which Scaliger considered the very best of his productions, are just such *πλάσματα*. In LI he is informed by the deity that he is destined to be the first orator. Demosthenes is his idol. He is told that he surpasses Dem. (XXVI 507, 576), that Plato could not compete with him, and all this praise stimulates in him the desire to rival, if not excel, the greatest orator that ever lived. Cf. Dind., Proleg. III 739-41.

<sup>2</sup> The gods are mentioned 39 times in LIV.

are two of the three chief characteristics which Blass ascribes to the Leptinea of Demosthenes. What would be more natural than that the intense vanity of the sophist should prompt him to select for imitation this ideal oration of his ideal author?<sup>1</sup>

Hyperbolical expressions are frequent in Aristeides, but are generally toned down by such phrases as *εἰ οἶόν τε εἰπεῖν, ὥς εἰπεῖν*. Schmid cites eight cases of the former in eight orations, and I find eleven with *ὥς εἰπεῖν* in LIV; in another part of his works I count a dozen in twenty-five pages. And this leads me to speak of the endless repetitions of words and phrases in immediate succession, which is so characteristic of all his orations. In the treatise *περὶ ῥητορικῆς*, Dind. II 43, the repetition of *στοχάζεσθαι* is especially reprehensible. Examples might be multiplied. Similarly in our oration, §2, *λόγον ποιεῖσθαι*, six times in six lines; §10, forms of *ἄξιος* nineteen times in fifteen lines; §111, *εὖ ποιεῖν*, seven times in eleven lines. In like manner such phrases as the following are done to death: *μόνοι τῶν πάντων, μάλιστα πάντων, δυοῖν θάτερον, ἐπανέλθωμεν δὲ ὅθεν ἐξέβημεν* (Dind. I 65), *ἐπάνειμι δὲ ὅθεν ἐξέβην* (I 77), and in our oration, §85, *ἄλλ' ἐκέισε πάλιν ἐπάνειμι*. In five speeches, IX–XIII, embracing a little more than one hundred pages, *ὅπερ ἔφην* is used seventeen times; in LIV it occurs six and in LIII nine times. Again, Aristeides is fond of lugging in words and whole phrases from the poets. Compare LIV 48 (*τούς τε ἐσομένους, πρό τε ὄντας, κατὰ τὸ ἔπος*), 75 (*τύμπανα καὶ κύφωνας, τὸ τῆς κωμωδίας*), 62 (*καὶ τὸ κλέος αὐτῆς οὐποτ' ὀλεῖται*), 108 (*ἐν τῷδε γὰρ κάμνουσιν αἱ πολλαὶ πόλεις, κατὰ τὴν τραγωδίαν, ὅταν τις ἐσθλὸς καὶ πρόθυμος ὦν ἀνὴρ μηδὲν φέρηται τῶν κακίωνων πλέον*) with the examples cited by Schmid, p. 295. So too with reminiscences of classic prose-writers, and in the use of proverbs and proverbial locutions.<sup>2</sup> The structure of the sentence in the orations in question is in accordance with the high style of the sophist. Periods are formed after the manner of Isokrates and Demosthenes, such as we find on nearly every page of XIII, XLV, XLVI and XXXIII–XXXVII.

I am indebted to Schmid for some of the material in the following conspectus.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Schmid, p. 10.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. LIII 12, 16, 20, 28, 39, 41, 47, 52, 54, 58, 60, with the examples cited by Schmid, pp. 263 and 297, and observe that the greatest number of proverbs occur in the oration of animated discussion (XLVI).

ORATIONS I-LII.	LIV.	LV.
<p>γίνομαι, not γίνομαι.  Use of the dual, esp. c. <i>δοῖν</i>.  Both aor. passives of <i>φαίνο</i>.  Final <i>τοῦ</i> c. inf., only three examples.  The art. with a sentence as substantive.<sup>1</sup>  <i>ἐκείνος</i> pointing to what follows, often.  Fut. pf. pass., frequent.  <i>εἶεν</i>, 38 examples.  <i>ἐκείνος</i>, frequent.  <i>καθάπαξ</i>, exceedingly frequent.  <i>οἷδ' ὄντι</i>, <i>εὖ οἷδ' ὄντι</i>, <i>εὖ οἶδα</i>.  <i>ἐξούλης</i>, XIII 164, XLV 133.  <i>ἐπηρεάζω</i> c. dat. (not c. acc., as in N. T.).  <i>ἐπίδοσις</i> = <i>increase</i>, XXVI 509.  <i>ἐρανος</i>, frequent.  <i>κέρδος</i>, a favorite word.  <i>οἶμαι</i> parenthetical, frequent.<sup>2</sup>  <i>πλήν</i> as conjunction.  <i>πάνν</i>, standing alone, 33 cases.  <i>σφόδρα</i>, not nearly so frequent as in Dio.  <i>οἷδ' ἂν εἰς</i>.  <i>οὐδὲν ὅτι</i> (metaph.), 12 examples cited by S.  Forms of <i>ὀφίη</i> parenthetical, 29 times.  <i>ὦ τάν</i>, 7 cases.  <i>δοῖν ἄτερον</i>, in 13 orations 22 times.  <i>ῥέινος</i> etc., S. cites 30 examples and says u. ὁ.  <i>ὥστε</i>, used more than <i>καθάπερ</i>.  Irony, seldom.  <i>Ἑλλανες καὶ βάρβαροι</i>, 127 times.  <i>εἶναι καὶ δοκεῖν</i>, XIII 174, 188.  <i>τοσούτων καὶ τηλικούτων</i>, often.  <i>τῆς οἰκονόμης</i> (γῆς), frequent.  <i>Ἡράκλεις</i>, 5 examples cited by S.  Dat. plural of <i>οὐδέεις</i> occurs.</p>	<p>The same.  Cf. §39, <i>δοῖν ποδοῖν</i>.  Likewise used.  Does not appear.  Also common, e. g. 2, 77.  Four examples.  <i>πεπράσται</i> (2), <i>κατελέλησται</i> (48).  §§18, 58.  Several occur.  At least two score.  Cf. §§34, 56, 76, 84.  Cf. §73.  So in 11, 81, 89. Cf. Dem. XX 142.  §34.  §60.  Cf. §§35 (bis), 73, 111.  §§15, 18, 49, 108.  Cf. §76.  Cf. §§5, 7, 69, 90.  Only twice.  Cf. §20.  Four examples.  Cf. §§14, 18.  Once (§7).  Especially common.  Frequent.  Likewise.  Also rare.  Thrice (32, 46, 79).  §36.  Four times (13, 16, 13, 43).  Occurs several times.  Twice (82, 111).  Cf. §16 (<i>οὐδέεν ἄλλοις</i>).</p>	<p>The same.  Two examples.  Numerous.  Cf. §72.  §18.  Cf. §§20, 27, 32, 44, 50, 51, 62.  §42.  Cf. §14.  Cf. §§5, 28.  Rare.  Cf. §§10, 27, 40, 60, 63, 70.  Once (30).  Very frequent.  Several times.  Likewise.  Rare.  §53.  Cf. §56 (<i>παρ' οὐδέαι</i>).</p>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Schmid, p. 46.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Dind. I 86.

ORATIONS I-LII.	LIV.	LIII.
<p>ἐναντιώσεις, 137 times. παρονομασία, comparatively frequent. Grouping of simple, compound or deriv. forms. ἀντιθέσεις, 188 cases + or. 46 (all anth.). χiasmós, 7 examples. (S. p. 284.) ἀντὶς αὐτοῦ c. art. or prep. not rare. ἀντὶνδρον, rare. πολυσύνδετον, predominates. Cf. D. I 54, 89. Alliteration, occasionally. D. I 117, 374.</p>	<p>Five times. Several examples. In the same manner. Very frequent and similar. Six examples. Once. No marked example. Six cases. §§2, 75, 108, 109.</p>	<p>Three times. (See below.) (See below.) Cf. Schmid, 280-81. Thrice.</p>
<p>σχηματα διανοίας.</p>	<p>Also especially frequent. Very often. Frequent. Similarly used. In the same manner. Rare. Scarcely any (see below). Three examples.</p>	<p>Likewise. Abundant. Frequent. Likewise. Similarly. Rare.</p>
<p>Rhetorical questions, innumerable. πῶς, πῶς γάρ, διὰ τί, common. ὑποφωρά, frequent. Apostrophe (Schmid, 290). Invocation of the gods. Exclamations, rare. Oaths, comparatively seldom. παράλειψις, 32 examples.</p>	<p>Use of Particles.</p>	<p>Rare. Frequent. Occurs. Four examples. Twice. Twice. Likewise.</p>
<p>ἀλλὰ γάρ, only 12 times. ἀλλὰ μὲν, 76 times in I-XLVIII. δέπου, abundant. δήπουθεν, 45 times. ἤπου, 32 cases. καὶ μὲν, 230 examples. καὶ ἤν καὶ, 18 times. οὐ μὲν, 49 times. οὐ μὲν ἀλλὰ, 27 cases. οὐκοῦν, 124 times in I-XLVI. γε after other particles, often.</p>		

Only a glance at the above conspectus is necessary in order to perceive the resemblance which the orations in question bear to the first fifty-two orations of Aristeides. The proportions (where statistics are given) are sufficiently striking to indicate that they are not the result of mere chance. That these should be *exactly* the same for all phenomena is, of course, not to be expected.

I said that oaths were not numerous in Aristeides, for although he uses *νῆ Δία* or *νῆ τὸν Δία*, according to Schmid, 80 times, this formula was used by Dionysios and the late Greek writers, not with the feeling that it was an oath, but merely by way of emphasis, and in connections where an oath would be ridiculous. This, or its use as a transition formula in the figure *ὑποφορά*, may account for the preponderance of the phrase in Aristeides—*πρὸς Διὸς* appears only twenty times, and other forms are rare. In LIV no oaths occur (except in *ὑποφορά*); in the companion speech a few; *νῆ Δία* (23, 59), *οὐ μὰ Δία* (64), *οὐ μέντοι μὰ Δία* (66), *μὰ τοὺς θεούς* (54, 58, 73), but note the formulae used.

The examples of *παρονομασία* are striking. Compare *ἀνομωτάτων* καὶ *ὠμοτάτων* (LIV 91) and *ἐκπέπτωκότας*, *ἐκπεπολεμωκώς* (LIII 73) with *οὐδὲν οὔτε εὔρηκα οὔτ' εἴρηκα* (Dind. I 400) and *ἡτύχεις, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἡτύχεις* (II 306) (this use of *μᾶλλον* is very common in all the orations). Somewhat similar is the juxtaposition of simple and compound, or derivative, forms. Compare *δι' ὧν . . . ἀποδέδεικται, δέδεικται . . .* (LIV 22) and *ἐνῆν . . . προσῆν . . . ἦν* (109) with *ᾤκισαν καὶ διᾤκισαν* (V 60), *ἔγνωσαν καὶ . . . μετέγνωσαν* (XLVI 321), *μὴ φρονήματι μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ καταφρονήματι*—cf. Thuk. 2, 62, 3—(Dind. II 516).<sup>1</sup>

In the three examples of *παράλειψις* in LIV, the very words (*σιωπῶ* and *ἔῶ*) are used which are most frequently employed in the other speeches. The form *ἔῶ* (not *ἔάσω*) occurs ten times.

"Auffällig ist der Gebrauch von *οὐ*," says Schmid, and cites: *εἰ δ' οὐκ ἂν φύγοιεν τὴν αἵρεσιν* (XIII 286, 304); *εἰ Πελοποννήσιοι οὐκ ἀποκνήσουσι* (XXIX 568, 24); *εἰ δ' οὐ μέτρια ἐποιοῦν* (XXXIII 604, 77), with eighteen other examples. Compare the following in LIV: *εἰ μὲν οὐδέσιν ἄλλοις . . . ἐνῆν* (16), *εἴπερ λητουργεῖν μὲν οὐκ ἔτι* (23), *εἰ . . . λόγος οὐδ' εἰστισοῦν αὐτοῖς ἦν* (37), *εἰ . . . τούτων οὐδὲν εἶλεν αὐτούς* (45), *εἰ . . . οὐκ ἀπῆλλακται* (50), *εἰ μὲν . . . οὐ προσείχετο ὅλως τὸν νοῦν* (76), *εἰ ἂρ' ἀξίος ἔστιν ἀνὴρ οὐκ ἀτελείας μόνον* (103), *εἰ δ' οὐκ ἀνεκτὸν . . . τοῦτ'*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *εὐ φρονούντων . . . εὐφραίνοντων* (XLIV 835), *εἰσεσθαι . . . πείσεσθαι* (XLVI 280), *θραυντέρους καὶ τραχυτέρους* (393), *ἡράσθη τε καὶ ἡγάσθη* (XLVII 416), *πρὸς τοὺς κειμένους τῇ πόλει νόμους καινοτομεῖ, καινοὺς τινὰς . . . εἰσάγων* (LIV 3), *οἷς πράττει, ἃ λέγεις, ἐλέγχεις* (LIV 11), *τοσούτων καὶ τηλικούτων* (LIV 13).

ἥδη (112). I find οὐ and μή both in the same construction in LIV 37, 51, 95, and XL 755, 280.

Among the many Herodotean expressions taken up in later Greek is τοῦτο μὲν . . . τοῦτο δέ. Aristeides uses it 39 times altogether, once in LIV (104) and twice in LIII (38, 53).

The ratio of the number of occurrences of καθάπερ to that of ὥσπερ in LIV is 2 to 5, in LIII, 2 to 9. There are some seventy cases of καθάπερ in the other works of Aristeides, and about four times as many examples of ὥσπερ.

The number of verbal adjectives in our two speeches is to the whole number as 1 to 20 (4 examples in these, and 80 in all, one of the former being construed personally, and three in the remaining orations).

In his desire to imitate Demosthenes, Aristeides in some matters goes beyond all bounds. This is the case with the articular infinitive. What complexes he uses with it can be seen in XXI, Dind. I 430, et passim, and in our orations on almost every page.

In LIII there are 59 examples of adjectives in the first attributive position with reference to the article, 82 of words and phrases of adjectival value, 6 of the second, and 3 of the third, all of the latter being in proper names, which hardly count. I have noticed only one case of the third position in the whole corpus of Aristeides, Dind. I 109, ἐπιθυμίας τῆς τριαύτης. The normal predominates. Hence in this regard, too, the Leptinean orations fall in line with the others.

J. E. HARRY.

## NOTES.

### ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF DIPHTHONGS IN MODERN ENGLISH FROM OE. *i* AND *û*.

In a paper on 'The *i*-Sound in English' (Am. J. Phil., vol. VI, p. 13), Dr. Balg says: "Concerning the nature of the diphthongization of *i* into *ai*, it must be remembered that the first element of the diphthong does, or originally did, not have the sound of *a* (= *a* in *far* or *man*), but that of close *e* (= *a* in *name*), which afterwards became open *e* (= *a* in *man*, or nearly so), and is now often heard as *a* in *far*."

I think, however, that it will be agreed that the first element of the Modern English diphthong, as heard in America, lies between the *a* in *far* and the *a* in *man*, and corresponds to Sweet's low-mixed-wide vowel; that is, American *i* is about equivalent to Mod. Ger. *ei*.

Just what the English pronunciation of this diphthong may be, it is not as easy to ascertain as one might think. In his word-lists Sweet writes *by* (*bai*), *while* (*whail*), *wife* (*waiſ*), etc. It is, however, expressly stated (vid. Preface, p. 10) that this 'broad Romic' *a* (= *a* in *father*) is no more than an approximation of the first element of the diphthong. What the author really means is his mid-mixed-wide vowel, for, as we see from his table on p. 3, he gives under that letter initial *e* in *eye* = *er* in *better*, and on p. 230 he says: "It is therefore probable that Salesbury's identification of English *i* with Welsh *ei* really points to the present English diphthong, mid-mixed-wide+high-front-wide"; i. e. *er* (in *better*) + *i* (in *bit*)—a result which, I think, will be news to most of us, even to those who suppose that they are acquainted with the English pronunciation of this diphthong.

I believe that some light is thrown upon the development of the diphthongized *i* in Mod. E., and also, incidentally, upon the action of phonetic laws in general, by the pronunciation of this diphthong which is still preserved in Virginia. *Before a voiceless consonant*—as, for example, in *ice*, *life*, *like*, *smite*, *ripe*, etc.—the Virginians pronounce the diphthongized *i* almost precisely

as Sweet represents his own pronunciation, i. e. the *i* = *er* (in *better*) + *i* (in Fr. *si*—not *i* in *bit*). This diphthong, as I pronounce it and hear it pronounced, is short, or rather half-long. *Before a voiced consonant*<sup>1</sup> and when final—for example, in *while*, *spire*, *lithe*, *wise*, *hind*, *drive*, *by*, *why*, etc.—the diphthong receives the usual American pronunciation mentioned above. Here we see the language-laws in operation: before voiced consonants and when final we have a full development of the diphthong, while before voiceless consonants it lags behind upon an older plane.

That this Virginian pronunciation of *i* is no new development, as Prof. Garnett seems to think ("The common narrowing and shortening of the diphthongal sounds," etc., *Am. J. Phil.*, vol. II, p. 489), but rather a relic of the English pronunciation of the 17th century, is proved (1) by the character of that people, who are noted for their stubborn conservatism and their hatred of new things, and (2) by the citations in Sweet's *Hist. Eng. Sds.* from phonetic authorities of the 16th and 17th centuries. Thus, Wallis and Cooper, who write in 1663 and 1685 respectively, give, or attempt to give, exactly this Virginian pronunciation of the diphthong (§§811, 812, 813). This was the period in which the colony was receiving a large influx of English settlers, and the pronunciation of this period has been preserved—not only in this respect, but in many others—down to the present day.

Thus the development of a diphthong from OE. *i* was as follows: OE. *i* > *ei* (= Romic *ei*) > *ei* (= *er* in *better* + *i* in Fr. *si*) > American *ei* (= Romic *äi*, Ger. *ei*) > Irish *oi* (as in *loike* [?]). As illustrating the tendency to pass from *ei* to *ai* in Mod. E., note the cockney pronunciation *naim* for *neim* (*name*)—I have even heard *näim*.

So much, then, for the manner in which the diphthong developed: let us now inquire into the cause. Sweet says (§820): "As soon as *i* in *wine* had become a distinct diphthong, the close *ee* of *ween* was moved up into its place, giving (*wiin*) a pronunciation which has lasted almost up to the present day." Upon examination of his phonetic authorities, however, we find (§818) that Palsgrave, who wrote in 1530, pronounces *we*, *me*, etc., as in living English, while the same author is quoted (§814) in order to prove that the old *i* had been preserved unchanged, at least in his dialect. This would go to show that the close *e* of *ween* had

<sup>1</sup> By voiceless, voiced, I mean *stimmlos*, *stimmhaft*. Under the latter, include the sonorous consonants (Sievers' *Phonetik*, S. 50 ff.).

moved up into the place of the *i* of *wine* before the latter had become a diphthong. It seems probable, therefore, that *e* having usurped, or encroached upon, the territory of the old *i*, it was found necessary to attempt to pronounce old *i* more distinctly, in order to prevent a confusion of the two sounds. This was done by means of an increased volume and force of expiration stream, the result being that the opening was made too wide and the tongue lowered too much.

The American pronunciation of diphthongized *u* is low-mixed-wide+high-back-narrow-round, i. e. about the Mod. Ger. *au*. Sweet gives the English sound as low-mixed-wide+low-mixed-narrow-round. The present Virginian pronunciation of this diphthong is just that given by Cooper, who wrote in 1685, viz. "*u* gutturalem ante *u* Germanicum" (Hist. Eng. Sds., §886), or in Romic notation *au*. I believe that the older pronunciation was *er* (in *better*) + *u* (as in Fr. *sou*), but that the two elements of the diphthong were later assimilated, the first element moving towards the second.

It is to be noted that the diphthong always has the above sound, *u* (in Eng. *but*) + *u* (as in Fr. *sou*), in the Virginian dialect, except where it is followed by *nd* (*n*+cons.) and *n*, as *pound*, *bound* (*sound*, *wound*, *found*, *ground*, *fount*, *mount*<sup>1</sup>), and *town*, *down*, *brown*, where it takes on the American sound, about Ger. *au*. The development in these cases may have been hastened by the powerful lengthening effect of a following *nd* (cf. Skeat, Prin. Eng. Etym., §378) (or *n*+consonant), and also of syllable-closing *n* (?) (cf. above, *i* before a voiced consonant). Another exception occurs in *now*, which I do not attempt to explain. Why should it have been differentiated from *how*, *cow*, *thou*, *brow*?

That the *u* was diphthongized after the development of the *o* into *oo*—which, we may remark in passing, is not heard as a diphthong in this country—will be seen upon a careful examination of the phonetic authorities quoted by Sweet in his Hist. Eng. Sds. (§§832, 833, 834, 827). The same result as in the case of *i* followed. The territory of the *u* being encroached upon, an attempt was made to make the sound more distinct, and an obscure sound was unconsciously uttered before it.

JOHN MORRIS.

<sup>1</sup>In the first four of these words the *u* was short in OE. As to *fount*, *mount*, Skeat suggests ME. *funt* (*funt*?), etc. (Prin. Eng. Etym., p. 405).

## NOTE TO CIC. TUSC. I 18-19.

Quid sit porro ipse animus aut ubi aut unde, magna dissensio est. Aliis cor ipsum animus videtur, ex quo 'excordes,' 'vaecordes,' 'concordes'-que dicuntur et Nasica ille prudens bis consul 'Corculum' et

Egregie 'cordatus' homo catus Aelius Sextus.

Empedocles animum esse censet cordi suffusum sanguinem. Aliis pars quaedam cerebri visa est animi principatum tenere. Aliis nec cor ipsum placet nec cerebri quandam partem esse animum sed alii in corde, alii in cerebro dixerunt animi esse sedem et locum. *Animum autem alii animam, ut fere nostri* DECLARANT NOMEN, *nam et 'agere animam' et 'efflare' dicimus et 'animosos' et 'bene animatos' et 'ex animi sententia'; ipse autem 'animus' ab 'anima' dictus est.*

In the passage above given I have followed the Tischer-Sorof edition<sup>8</sup>, but the words printed in small capitals have been restored according to the MSS. The italicised sentence has been variously manipulated by the editors. Seyffert proposed a period after *nostri* and emended to *Declarant nomina*. Kühner prefixes an *Id* (following Könighoff), to the undoubted benefit of the Latinity. Wolf read *nomine*, without a period after *nostri*—a better correction than Seyffert's, I should think, for the position with his interpretation ought to be °*alii ut fere nostri animam* etc. Still another correction is *Declarat nomen*.

The expedient of rejecting is also tried for this passage. Moser brackets the words *Declarat . . . sententia* as a skilful gloss. All the bracket-employers end with *sententia*; some begin with *nam* and some with *et animosos*.<sup>1</sup>

The use of the brackets will show the mode of interpretation of the various editors. I quite agree with Tischer-Sorof in the Kritischer Anhang, that the words *et animosos . . . sententia* are not a gloss but part of the text. Cicero is unquestionably toying, it seems to me, with the etymological connections of *animus*, as just before he toys with *cor*, *excordes*, *vaecordes*, *concordes*, *Corculum* and *cordatus*. Seyffert accordingly connects *animosos* with *animus*, and *animatos* with *anima*. The last sentence of the Tischer-Sorof note seems to me clearly incorrect: "Das letzte Beispiel *ex animi sententia* scheint er lediglich der Gleichmässigkeit

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Chase's edition, note ad loc., which I have adapted to my own statement of the views that have obtained.

keit wegen hinzugefügt zu haben, um gleichviel für *animus* und *anima* anzuführen, und daran schliesst sich das folgende *ipse autem animus* sehr passend an." On the contrary, Cicero is making a most careful use of words, as I shall seek to prove below.

I venture on another interpretation, and one allowing us to keep the MS reading. Cicero, we must remember, is etymologizing: "Some have said that the soul is ANIMA, and so<sup>1</sup> almost all of us explain (etymologically) its name." We might almost translate, 'define the noun,' taking *nomen* as a *terminus technicus*.<sup>2</sup> Now Cicero goes on with the motive for this definition: "For we say 'yield up our spirit' and 'expire' (*anima*-) and 'spirited' (*animo*-), and 'good-hearted' (*anima*-) and 'to our heart's wish' (*animo*-<sup>3</sup>)." Then the argument is clinched with "now (*autem*) '*animus*' is derived from *anima*."

But to this explanation objections may be raised: *anima* is for this passage usually defined by 'air.' But that *anima* meant 'air,' as a synonym of *aër*, no one will maintain: the definition here is 'breath,' but the fault of all definition is that there results exclusion; *anima* is breath and air too, in solution, so to speak. We can see this from Tusc. I 42: *Is autem animus . . . ex inflammata anima constat*. Out of *inflammata anima* Cic. resolves the two elements (*duo genera*) fire and air, and says of these: *necesse est ferantur ad caelum et ab iis perrumpatur et dividatur crassus hic et concretus aer etc.* The soul passes above the reeking earth (43): *Quam regionem cum superavit animus naturamque sui similem contigit et agnovit iunctis ex anima tenui et ex ardore solis temperato ignibus insistit et finem altius se efferendi facit*. The words *inflammata anima* give us a clew, perhaps, to the origin of the next definition of the soul (Tusc. §19): *Zenoni Stoico animus ignis videtur*. The soul was doubtless first identified with the warm breath of life, out of which warmth and air were variously taken as the essential elements.

Another objection may be made to my interpretation: I have taken *et agere animam et efflare* as amounting to one term

<sup>1</sup> I venture to divide *ut* into a copulative conjunction and a demonstrative in recognition of its relative origin.

<sup>2</sup> Not so cited by L. and S., save for Quintilian.

<sup>3</sup> The change from 'spirit' to 'heart' seeks to emphasize the etymologizing of Cicero, and foreshadows at the same time my interpretation of the balance in the terms.

balancing *animosos*, and *bene animatos* as balancing *ex animi sententia*. This I justify by the repetition of the *et* with both infinitives and the position of *dicimus*, as well as by the balanced arrangement of *et agere animam . . . efflare* (A) *et animosos* (B) *et bene animatos* (A) *et ex animi sententia* (B). The use of *et* with all the terms comes from their equal relation to *dicimus*. The four terms are all equally the grammatical objects of *dicimus*. If one of the terms is itself divided into two, still we do not violate the rule (cf. Riemann, *Syntaxe Latine*<sup>2</sup>, §271 *b*) for such cases, for we could not say *agere animam efflareque*, nor *a. a. atque efflare*, because the two verbs do not make one concept (*que*), nor is a more important word added to explain another (*atque*). Neither can we take the single '*animam*' as the object of the two verbs, but in the phrase *et agere animam et efflare* the doubling of the '*et*' is shorthand for doubling '*animam*.'<sup>1</sup> Certain it is that no other word but *et* could be used to join all the terms.

Finally, I again call express attention to Cicero's nice use of these four terms: the two first terms *et agere animam et efflare* and *et animosos* exhibit the identity of the stems *animo-* and *anima-* for the meaning 'breath' ('life'), and the terms *et bene animatos et ex animi sententia* show their identity for the meaning 'mind.' A like niceness is seen in the group of congeners of *cor* (§18), where the terms *excordes*, *vaecordes*, *concordesque* are massed in one, as it were, whereas the more difficult *Corculum* and *cordatus* are prepared for by *prudens* and *catus*.

WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY,  
LEXINGTON, VA.

EDWIN W. FAY.

#### CORRIGENDA IN WICKHAM'S HORACE.

During the past year, while engaged in reading Wickham's larger edition of Horace (Clarendon Press, Oxford; vol. I, second edition, 1877; vol. II, 1891), Mr. John Maclean Magie, a graduate student here, noticed the majority of the *errata* detailed in this note. The others, excepting one, came out in my own reading. That one happens to be the only serious error in the list, and was pointed out to me by Dr. Willard Humphreys. It is the mistake

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Tusc. §21 *quā vel agamus quid vel sentiamus*, where the position of *quid* exactly parallels that of *animam* in our passage.

made in styling Alyattes, the father of Croesus, 'the son of Croesus' (vol. I, p. 219, note on 'Alyattei').

The others are usually typographical slips, which, though inevitable in so elaborate an edition as Wickham's with its profusion of cross-references, ought to be studiously corrected by those who care for "the sacred cause of typographical accuracy."

### *List of Errors.*

Volume I (Odes, Carmen Saeculare, Epodes).—Page xxv: In the closing paragraph, why is there no mention of Sir Theodore Martin's translation? 'Leipsig,' eleven lines from the bottom, should be made 'Leipsic,' as elsewhere on the same page. P. xxviii, 12 lines from bottom, change 'emin' to 'enim.' P. 15, verse 11, change 'gaudentum' to 'gaudentem.' P. 64, the number 5 is missing after verse 5. P. 104, 10 lines from top, 'B. C. 25' should be corrected to 'B. C. 24'; see author's introductory note to bk. III, ode 14 (on p. 212). P. 138, verse 7, change 'amóros' to 'amores.' P. 140, line 8 of note on v. 2, 'Od. 3. 6. 32' should be 'Od. 3. 6. 36.' P. 219, note on v. 41, change 'the son of Croesus' to 'the father of Croesus'; see Herodotus, I 26. P. 231, verse 2, change 'Phidyde' to 'Phidyde.' P. 254, verse 55, separate 'meinvolvo' into 'me involvo.' P. 287, at end of v. 40 put a period. P. 328, note to v. 7, strike out reference 'quine, Sat. 1. 10. 21'; compare Wickham's correction in vol. II, p. 101, at the end of his note on 'quine.' P. 330, at end of v. 10 put the numeral 10. P. 331, first line, strike out perpendicular printer's line after 'mugientium.' P. 332, end of note on 'rara,' change 'io' to 'to.'

Volume II (Satires, Epistles, Ars Poetica).—Page 54, first line, change 'pactor' to 'pacto.' P. 57, the note on v. 104 should be numbered 105. P. 152, the note on 'vitrea' is not helpful; the key to the figurative sense of 'vitrea' lies in the sentence of Publilius Syrus: *Fortuna vitrea est: tum cum splendet frangitur.* Both 'glitter' and 'fragility' are involved. P. 155, note on v. 262, change 'Epod. 11: 31' to 'Epod. 11. 21.' P. 165, note on 'aliena' in v. 57, change reference 'v. 26' to 'v. 25.' P. 196, should there be a comma at end of v. 103? P. 199, note on v. 1, change reference 'Sat. 1. 10. 40' to 'Sat. 1. 10. 42.' P. 200, note on v. 13, change reference 'Sat. 1. 3. 9' to 'Sat. 1. 3. 10.' P. 203, in vv. 57 and 58 it is desirable to put the clause 'postquam nihil esse periculi Sensimus' between commas. P. 210, nine lines from bottom,

change '2. 29' to '3. 29.' P. 213, in the numbers prefixed to the analysis of Epistle I change '49-31' to '49-52,' and '52-56' to '53-56.' P. 217, note on v. 31, change 'Sat. 2. 7. 16' to 'Sat. 2. 7. 15.' P. 222, note on v. 89, change 'Od. 2. 16. 43' to 'Od. 3. 16. 43.' P. 225, tenth line of note on v. 4, change 'Sat. 1. 3. 126' to 'Sat. 1. 3. 127.' P. 231, last line of note on v. 2, change 'Od. 4. 14. 4' to 'Od. 4. 14. 14.' P. 232, seventh line of note on v. 10, change 'lacus et vivos' to 'lacus et rivos.' P. 233, note on 'thyma' in v. 21, change 'Od. 4. 2. 27' to 'Od. 4. 2. 29.' P. 234, eighth line of note on v. 26, change 'Epod. 11. 25' to 'Epod. 11. 17.' P. 236, note on v. 16, change 'Sat. 2. 3. 45' to 'Sat. 2. 3. 44.' P. 242, note on v. 6, change 'Od. 3. 24. 1' to 'Od. 3. 24. 2.' P. 244, end of note on v. 27, change 'Od. 4. 7. 17' to 'Od. 4. 7. 15.' P. 247, a comma after 'istis' in v. 67 would be an improvement. P. 249, note on v. 21, change 'Od. 2. 13. 9' to 'Od. 2. 13. 20.' P. 251, note on v. 36, change 'Od. 1. 14. 1' to 'Epp. 1. 14. 1.' P. 251, note on 'divitiis Arabum' in v. 36, change last reference '3. 24. 1' to '3. 24. 2.' P. 253, beginning of note on v. 57, change 'Od. 4. 12. 8' to 'Od. 4. 12. 28.' P. 450, fifth line, change 'headings in Index II' to 'headings in Index III.'

PRINCETON, *July*, 1893.

ANDREW F. WEST.

## REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles. Edited by Dr. J. A. H. MURRAY. Part VII. Consignificant-Crouching. Part VIII, Sect. I. Crouchmas-Czech, completing vol. II (C). Oxford, At the Clarendon Press, 1893.

Dr. Murray's great Dictionary is progressing slowly but surely. The letter C is now finished, and Vol. III, Part I, E-Every, edited by Mr. Henry Bradley, appeared two years ago. We are promised soon another part of volume III, but such an undertaking cannot be hurried, however impatient readers may get. The part before us, we are told, contains 5414 main words, 936 combinations, and 1190 subordinate words and forms: total, 7540. "Of the 5414 main words, 1208 (22½ per cent.) are marked † as obsolete, and 171 (3½ per cent.), ‖ as alien or incompletely naturalized." Dr. Murray notes in this part many words of interesting etymology and form-history, and remarks upon them with great truth: "Research into the history of words, as of families, sometimes merely shows that current notions as to their origin are historically untenable, and that their actual origin is involved in obscurity." An interesting illustration of form-history is given in the case of the word *Cross*. Previous etymological dictionaries—even that of Professor Skeat—have been content with telling us that it is derived from Latin *crucem* through O. French *crois*, and giving us the collateral Romance forms. Dr. Murray informs us that "the Latin *crux* entered our language by three distinct routes, and in four different forms, and that it was the form which came by the most circuitous route that was eventually the survivor." This form was not, as is usually thought, derived from the Norman-French, but was "that which early Christianity had naturalized in Ireland, and Irish missionary zeal had communicated to the Norsemen—the Latin-Irish-Norse-North English *cross*, that became the permanent form in our language." If we turn to the word itself we find the earliest example of the use of the word in the local name *Normannes cros*, in a 'Record of Gifts by Bishop Athelwold to Medeshamstede' (i. e. Peterborough), circa 963-84, 100 years before the Normans came over, hence *Normannes* here is *Norðmannes*, the Northman, the so-called *Dane* of history. Again, Wace, in his *Roman de Rou*, circa 1175, gives us as the battle-cry of Harold at Hastings (Senlac), "*Olicrosse sovent criout*," and he explains it: "*Olicrosse est en engleiz Ke Sainte Croix est en franceiz*." This is conclusive that *cross* was in Northern English long before *croix* (*crois*, *croiz*), and it stayed. If we had the documentary means of investigation, the inquiry might deserve consideration, whether its introduction was not due to the influence of Iona on Northumbria, and hence antecedent to Norse influence on English, the Northern *cross* corresponding to the Southern *röd*. As an illustration of the extent and thoroughness with which this work is prepared, it may be added that the word *Cross* fills fifteen columns, besides seventeen more devoted to its compounds.

There are a few points that have been noticed in turning over the pages which may deserve mention, not by way of criticism, but as showing that it is impossible to embrace everything even in such a comprehensive dictionary. Under the word *Cracker*, 4, the quotation from the *Beacon* (Boston) that "the word *Cracker* . . . is supposed to have been suggested by their cracking whips over oxen or mules in taking their cotton to the market" (!), is likely to perpetuate a false derivation. The true derivation is, much more probably, that these country people lived on *cracked* corn, as some of them still do, which derivation is given in the *Century Dictionary*. That it is not 'a contemptuous name' may be inferred from the fact that the Georgia students' club of the University of Virginia has assumed the name of 'Georgia Crackers.' Perhaps the common game of *Crack-loo*, or *Crack-a-loo*, as some call it, is unknown in England. At all events, the word is not found in the *New English Dictionary*, and for the information of the editor it may be mentioned that the game is played by two or more persons, and consists in shooting a small coin to the ceiling and letting it fall near a crack in the floor. The owner of whichever coin falls nearest the designated crack 'takes the pile.' The term is of uncertain etymology, and the spelling may not be that given above, as it is not found in any dictionary that I have examined, although common enough colloquially. It has been suggested that the name may be shortened from 'Crack or lose'; or it may be derived from compounding the word *Loo*, the game at cards, with the word *Crack*, which plays the important part in the game. The same may be said for the game *Crap*, so common among 'American citizens of African descent,' and, as it is a violation of the statute against gambling, it often results in bringing the ebony players before the Police Court. I am informed that it is played with dice, generally three, and consists in shuffling them in the hand and throwing them on the ground or floor, the players betting on the number that will turn up, the numbers *seven* and *eleven* being those commonly used. It is popularly termed 'shooting craps.'<sup>1</sup> Dr. Murray can put it in his next issue, or his *omnium gatherum* of an appendix.

I do not find that some terms of our American university slang have crossed the water. I look in vain for the verb *Cork* in the sense of failing on a recitation: it may be transitive or intransitive, according as it is applied to professor or student. I find the terms *Cram* and *Crib* duly recorded, being doubtless in use by English-speaking students all over the world, but the earliest example of the former as noun is taken from 'Verdant Green' (1853). Bristed, in his 'Five Years in an English University,' written in 1851 (see A. J. P. XIII 494), had already defined it in his glossary of 'The Cantab Language.'

If each writer will contribute from his store of colloquialisms and slang, we may eventually secure a complete *Thesaurus totius Anglicitatis*.

Part VIII, Section I, of the *New English Dictionary* completes the letter C and the second volume, as this letter occupies a whole volume. The number of words treated in this volume is 29,295, made up as follows: 21,295 main words, 3461 special combinations, and 4539 subordinate words. Of the main words, 15,852 are current, 4515 obsolete, and 928 alien = 21½ per cent. obso-

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps the 'pile' is here the 'crop,' in ore Africano 'crap,' hence the name of the game.

lete, and  $4\frac{3}{8}$  per cent. alien or not fully naturalized. Dr. Murray gives also the whole number of words so far treated under A, B and C as 60,549, being 43,527 main words, 7753 special combinations, and 9269 subordinate words. Of these main words, 31,232 are current, 10,497 obsolete, and 1798 alien, showing that for these three letters " $71\frac{3}{8}$  per cent. are now current and fully naturalized,  $24\frac{1}{8}$  per cent. are obsolete,  $4\frac{1}{8}$  per cent. alien or imperfectly naturalized; more than three-fourths of all the words included being thus in living use." This proportion will doubtless hold good throughout, and we may thus get some idea of the extent of our present vocabulary. We are told that the letter C is the second largest letter in the alphabet, being exceeded only by S; that it contains nearly as many words as A and B together, and as many as the nine smallest letters, X, Z, Y, Q, K, J, N, U, V, with three-fourths of the tenth, O. The many words of Latin origin or composition swell the list to this great number. Our attention is called, in the general Preface, to many words of both native and foreign origin that are treated at great length, and that are of special interest. Not only is this great Dictionary valuable for its minute analysis of the meanings of words, and its tracing of the history of these meanings, far exceeding anything that has been heretofore done, but it is specially valuable for the scientific etymology of English words. "The historical method followed," says Dr. Murray, "has cleared the origin and history of hundreds of words from the errors in which conjectural 'etymology' had involved them; it has established the actual derivation of many, and has left the origin of others as unknown and, to all appearance, lost." It is somewhat remarkable that the etymology of such a common word as *Cut*—which as noun occupies four columns and as verb, along with adverbial combinations, thirteen columns—should be unknown. The earliest example is from Layamon's Brut, text B, in the past tense *cutte*, where it replaces *nom* of text A: text B is assigned to 1275 A. D., as against 1205 for text A. We are told that it is "found in end of 13th c., and in common use since the 14th c., being the proper word for the action in question, for which O. E. used *sniðan*, *ceorfan*. . . . The word is not recorded in O. E. (nor in any W. Ger. dialect), and there is no corresponding verb in Romanic." An Old Teutonic stem *\*kut-*, *\*kot-* is regarded as the source of the English verb; but its exact origin is obscure. Dr. Murray, on the authority of Professor Rhys, rejects the conjectural derivation from the Welsh *cwta* 'shoot.' Also, he says that the origin of *cut* = lot and its original sense are uncertain, and he is inclined to regard it as a distinct word from the noun *Cut* derived from the verb. It is historically much older, as the phrase *draw cuts* occurs as early as 1300, whereas the other noun *Cut* is not earlier than the sixteenth century.

As an example of minute analysis, we find under the verb *Cut*, 33, *c*, as early as 1814, "For *cutting* his lectures this morning at eight," an expression so common now as university slang.

The first word in this part, *Crouchmas*, is one of interest, being applied to "The festival of the Invention of the Cross, observed on May 3" from the 14th century on, the earliest example given being from *English Gilds*, dating from 1389. The calendar date for this festival is May 3, but Grein and Wülker have both stated that the Latin 'Life of St. Cyriacus' is given

in the *Acta Sanctorum* under May 4, although a Greek 'Life' belongs to May 3. Brady's *Clavis Calendaria* (1812) gives the date of this festival as May 3, and a church calendar for 1893 lying before the writer has the same date. Also, the Latin 'Life' on which the Anglo-Saxon poem 'Elene' is based has in so many words: "celebrare commemorationem diei in qua inventa est sancta Crux quinto nonarum Maiarum." Can there be any mistake as to the date in the *Acta Sanctorum*? This work is not accessible to me.

It would be interesting to comment on many suggestive words, if time permitted. I would call attention to but one or two. Rosalynde's "gallant *curtelax* upon 'my thigh," with its various spellings, is nothing more than "A much-perverted form of the word *Cutlass* (in 16th c. *coutelas*, *coutelase*, *cuttleass*, etc.), through the intermediate perversions *cut(f)le-ax*, and *curtelas*, *courtelace*, *curtelace*, the peculiarities of which it combines. The form *curtal ax*, with its variants, was so distinct from *cutlass* that it acquired a kind of permanent standing, the identification of the final part with *ax*, *axe*, being favored by the use of the weapon in delivering slashing blows." We see here the phonetic insertion of *r* and the change of *s* to *x* under the influence of popular etymology. *Coutelas* itself is an "augmentative of *couteau* (*coutel*) 'knife': cognate with It. *coltellaccio*: Lat. type \**cultellāceum*." This is a good illustration of the influence of popular etymology on the form of a word.

Looking for *Cymling*, we find it, but are referred to *Simlin* for further information, the only example given being one from Morse's 'American Geography,' I 192 (1796). Now, *Cymling* is the form given in both Webster and Worcester, but if we consult the cookery books, the form varies greatly. Mrs. Tyree's 'Housekeeping in Old Virginia' gives *Cymlings* in text, but *Cymlins* in index, a common phonetic loss; Mrs. Hollyday's 'Domestic Economy' gives *Cymlings* in text, but *Cymbelines* (!) in index. Here we have the phonetic insertion of *b* and some superfluous *e*'s. We often hear *Cymbelins*, insertion of *b*, after the analogy of *crumble* and *number*, and loss of *g*. It is hard to say which form will survive. The catalogues of garden vegetables give us no help, as they avoid the word and use only *Squash*. The Century Dictionary gives the spellings *Cymbelin* and *Cymbeling*; the former is the more common in the Southern States. If, as Worcester says, the word is "akin to *Cymbal* and to Gr. *κνυβίον*," the *b* is not a phonetic insertion, but the word has suffered a phonetic loss.

Following the association of ideas, we look in vain in the first part of C for *Cashaw*, pronounced locally *cushaw*, *u* as in *cut*. The writer has heard it applied to a kind of squash, although White, 'Gardening for the South' (1857), defines it under *Pumpkin* (p. 214), but he says that the pumpkin "has become so crossed and intermingled with the squash that it is difficult to say of some varieties to which species they should be referred." He also says under *Squash* (p. 213): "The Cashaw pumpkin is a pretty good substitute for the winter squash." Bartlett gives: "*Cashaw*, sometimes spelt *Kershaw*. A pumpkin. Western"; but it is also Southern, as I can testify. *Cashaw* given in the Century Dictionary = honey-locust, is a different thing altogether, and this word is omitted. But this must suffice.

J. M. GARNETT.

Cornelii Taciti Dialogus de Oratoribus. A Revised Text, with Introductory Essays and Critical and Explanatory Notes, by W. PETERSON, M. A., LL. D., Principal of University College, Dundee, St. Andrews University. xcii + 120 pp. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1893.

This is the first edition of the Dialogus yet published in English. The introductory essays are five in number, and treat of the question of authorship and date of the Dialogue, its substance and scheme, the interlocutors and their parts, the style and language of the work, and lastly the MSS.

As regards authorship, the editor, as may be seen by the title of the book, defends the tradition of the MSS; yet he fails to make his case as strong as he might easily have done. One of the most cogent supports of the Tacitean authorship of our treatise is the internal evidence derived from a comparison of the diction, syntax and style of the Dialogus with that of the acknowledged works of Tacitus. To have marshalled this evidence along with the other arguments adduced would have been a simple task and would have added not a little to the force of this part of the Introduction.

The date of composition of the piece Principal Peterson believes, with Wolff, to have been 84-85 A. D., ten years after the dramatic date of the dialogue. The only object in assuming this late date for the composition of the work is to put the discussion far enough in the past to justify the author's reference to himself at the time as *iuvenis admodum*. But an interval of ten years at Tacitus's time of life is not needed to account for this phrase. If we assume that the author was eighteen at the time of the discussion, he might easily have referred to himself as *iuvenis admodum* seven years later, at the age of twenty-five. This would have been 81 A. D., the concluding year of Titus's reign. If, on the other hand, we set the date of composition as late as 84 or 85 A. D., we at once meet several difficulties. Not only is it inconsistent with Tacitus's explicit declaration in Agricola 3, to believe that he wrote anything in the reign of Domitian, but it is particularly improbable that he would have ventured the allusions to Vibius Crispus under that emperor. Moreover—and this is not the slightest consideration—every year deducted from the interval between the Dialogus and the Agricola and Germania adds to the difficulty of accounting for the changed style of the later works.

In the sketch of the interlocutors and their parts the editor pronounces against assigning chaps. 36-40. 7 to Secundus. He consequently rejects the theory of a lacuna before the words *non de otiosa re* in the latter chapter. This may be the safer view, yet we should like to see some consideration paid to the fact that Secundus, having allowed Maternus (chap. 16. 8) to promise a speech from him, may properly be expected to appear again in the discussion. Yet even without this, the evidence which Dr. Peterson presents in favor of assigning chaps. 36-40. 7 to Secundus will, it is predicted, weigh quite as heavily with many unbiassed readers as the counter-arguments in favor of Maternus.

The chapter on language and style might well have been fuller in scope and in detail. As illustrations of more noteworthy omissions may be cited the lack of any reference to the occurrence of alliteration in the Dialogus, pro-

nounced as that feature is throughout the treatise. Nor do we find any statement of the facts as to the use of *quavis* with the subjunctive denoting something real, of the employment of the subjunctive with *quamquam*, of the subjunctive of indefinite frequency. A complete presentation of the essential facts of the syntax and style of the *Dialogus* would have been a useful and appropriate accompaniment of an edition of the scope of this, the more so as Dräger's treatment of the *Dialogus* material in all editions of his 'Syntax und Stil' is of a decidedly stepmotherly sort.

By far the largest space, relatively, is allotted to a consideration of the MSS. Here, as was to be expected, due recognition is made of Scheuer's convincing reconstruction of the MSS of the Y class. This is followed by an account of the hitherto neglected Harleianus (2639 in the British Museum). Dr. Peterson thinks this MS of great importance for the history of the constitution of the text, a view difficult to reconcile with the statement on p. lxxvi that Parisiensis 7773 is an almost exact copy of Harleianus, inasmuch as the Paris codex is of extremely little worth. Nor can I find that the editor has made the Harleianus the basis of any emendations or found in it grounds for the definitive support or rejection of any doubtful readings.

As regards the text, it can hardly be asserted that the editor's own conjectures have contributed to its improvement. Dr. Peterson's method as a textual critic is, in fact, not easy to understand. As a rule, his proposed emendations are laid before us without arguments in their favor, palaeographical or other, and without any attempt to anticipate the most obvious objections likely to be urged against them. Thus, at 5. 12 the conjecture *aliquem inveniri contigit* is in open defiance of Latin usage. An infinitive accompanied by a subject accusative does not occur with *contigit* until the time of Apuleius. So also at 26. 12 the reading *facetis hominibus* involves the assumption of a ἀπαξ λεγ. in *facetis*, to say nothing of the resulting sense, or of the use of the dative here, which is no easier to account for to-day than when Rhenanus proposed *quibusdam*, and which is not paralleled by Ann. II 33. 6 *erat adhuc frequens senatoribus promere*. In 37. 36 the proposal to read *vellicent* ignores the demands of the context, which calls for the notion of 'admiring scenes of conflict,' not of 'belittling what involves no risk.' Of other proposed conjectures several are already the property of other scholars, whose claims Dr. Peterson ignores. Thus, at 31. 31 *divitem* is the conjecture of Urlichs (Rhein. Mus. XXXI, p. 529); *suis* at 20. 15 stands in Halm's fourth edition; while *intelleges* at 3. 9 was proposed by Greef, *De praepositionum usu apud Tacitum*, p. 55; *Lexicon Taciteum*, p. 760 b. Of the few remaining conjectures of the editor, one only can possibly commend itself, viz. *ius huius civitatis* at 30. 15. This is ingenious, and palaeographically more probable than Gudeman's *ius suae civitatis*, though the latter emendation has a striking Ciceronian parallel in its favor. *Reverentia* at 40. 10 seems to have been suggested not so much by the MS tradition *sine servitute*, as by Pithou's conjecture *sine severitate*. The supposed advantages of the conjecture *grata quae*, at 6. 27, over Novák's *grata sunt quae* are not pointed out. Neither of these two conjectures, nor any of the several very similar ones, seems to me so adequately to solve the difficulties of this vexed passage as to read *quamquam quaedam serantur*, etc. The MS *alia*, as Gudeman has already convincingly

shown in this Journal (XII, p. 329), is nothing but an erroneous dittography of the following *diu*. But *diu* itself I believe to be corrupt. I base this conviction upon the utter impossibility of satisfactorily disposing of the word in its context. *Diu* might possibly be defended with *elaborentur*, but the notion of things which 'are a long time a-planting' is absurd under any circumstances, and particularly so in the present context. I am therefore convinced that *diu* represents an original *-dam*, whose first syllable *quae* was swallowed up in the preceding *quamquam*. The scribe of the archetype had already committed one such slip in this sentence (*ingenio for in ingenio*), and it is easy to believe that he was guilty of a second. The sense of the passage then would be: "For 'tis with the mind as with a field; tho' certain things are planted and cultivated, yet more pleasing are those that spring up of their own accord."

In interpretation Dr. Peterson has made good use of the labors of his predecessors, but that is all. One looks in vain for any original contributions to the elucidation of the text.

*Vagum*, at 9. 23, is taken, with Wolff, as synonymous with *volucere* 'fleeing.' I can find no warrant for this. The word seems rather to mean 'capricious,' as elsewhere.

In 28. 23 *principes liberos* is taken to mean 'their distinguished sons.' This is impossible, whether we consider the context or the regular signification of *principes*. The children were not 'eminent' or 'remarkable,' nor would it be to the point to allude to them as such. *Principes* is to be taken predicatively — 'trained them up to be leaders.' Cf. Wolff's 'sie zu grossen Männern herangebildet haben.'

A strange slip occurs at 7. 2 in the note on *latus clavus*, which is explained as 'the toga with the broad purple border running down the front.' The *latus clavus* was, of course, not a decoration of the toga, but of the tunic, and was not a border, but a vertical stripe. The editor has confused the *tunica laticlavaria* of the senators with the *toga praetexta* of curule magistrates.

The note at 40. 8 on *omnes omnia poterant* is contradictory. The phrase is held to be "a reminiscence of Vergil's 'non omnia possumus omnes,' except that here *omnes* = *οἱ πάντες*." But if this last is true, as it undoubtedly is, it is impossible to detect any reminiscence. At 21. 3 Toranius is mentioned as the 'tutor' of Octavius. This is a mistranslation of Suetonius's words (Aug. 27): *proscripsit C. Toranium suum tutorem*, 'his own guardian.'

But it is in the treatment of the language of the Dialogus and in the notes on grammatical points that one feels the most serious defect of the edition before us. The valuable data of linguistic usage accumulated in the Lexicon Taciteum have not been utilized to any extent; Wölfflin's Archiv, Reisig-Haase's Vorlesungen, Schmalz's Syntax und Stilistik have apparently been entirely neglected. The note on 6. 17, *coire, circumfundī*, takes these infinitives as exclamatory. This view, first suggested, I believe, by Goelzer, is unsupported by the facts of the language. The exclamatory infinitive in Latin is invariably the expression of indignation, scorn, or some kindred feeling. It never has the notion, imperatively demanded here, of 'consider what a glorious thing it is!' The two infinitives in question must be joined with the preceding *studium*; the first clause has the gerund, the second the

infinitive—an instance of that inconcinnity of construction so common in the later works of Tacitus, though rare, it must be admitted, in the *Dialogus*. In the note on *agunt feruntque* in 8. 18 it certainly ought to be noted that the usual form of this phrase is *ferunt aguntque*, and that the *rare* inversion occurs also sporadically in Greek. Cf. Xen. Hell. VI 5. 50. The collocation *nedum ut*, found at 10. 5, is so unusual that the other instances of its occurrence might well be noted. To Livy, III 14. 6, cited by Peterson, I add from Harvard Studies (II, p. 113): Livy, XXX 21; Apuleius, Met. V 10; IX 29; Tert. Marc. I 23. In 23. 3 Aper accuses Cicero of ending every other sentence in his speeches with the phrase *esse videatur*. Here we note the absence of any statement of the actual frequency of this phrase in Cicero's orations. In reality Aper's assertion involves the grossest exaggeration, no hint of which is given in the note on the passage. *Clientulorum* in 37. 2 is not the only instance of this word in Latin, as stated in the note at that point. Andresen, in his *Programm des Askanischen Gymnasiums*, 1892, states that *clientulis* is the MS reading also in Ann. XI 5.

An unusually large number of minor errors disfigures the book. Thus, Ulrichs is regularly referred to as Ulrichs (e. g., pp. lxii, lxvi), once as Ulrich (p. 63)—yet once correctly (p. lxxvii). Oberbreyer appears as Obermeyer in the only place where he is cited. Brachyology (sic) is the editor's unvarying designation for brachylogy, e. g. on 6. 15, 23. 8, 41. 25. *Hos idus* is a proposed reading at 17. 7. Clear misprints are *madantis* for *madentis* on 17. 7; *praemirorum* on 28. 5; *clientelle* on 36. 20; 'position' for 'portion' on 26. 10; to say nothing of numerous slips like 'treatsie' for 'treatise,' 'unnecessarily,' 'is' for 'it,' 'as' for 'us,' etc.

On the whole, one cannot resist the feeling that the editor has taken for his motto Maternus's *maturare libri huius editionem festino*. A work which should have taken years of laborious deliberation has apparently been prepared and put through the press in great haste. It may be seriously doubted whether the interests of learning are best promoted in this way.

CHAS. E. BENNETT.

---

Platonstudien von Dr. FERDINAND HORN. Wien, F. Tempsky, 1893.

Plato and Platonism, by WALTER PATER. New York, Macmillan & Co., 1893.

It is possible to write about Plato in such a way as to kill all interest in Plato, although Plato, if let alone, is the most fascinating of authors; and there is so vast an amount of arid literature heaped about the subject that one is inclined to forgive Mr. Pater for his set purpose to make Plato interesting, and to thank Dr. Horn for not repelling us by his *Platonstudien*. Dr. Horn is one of those who think that Zeller has made an end of the grammatico-statistical method by which sundry unphilosophical souls once fondly expected to reach an objective standard (see A. J. P. X 470), and that there is nothing left but a return to Schleiermacher. To be sure, Schleiermacher failed, but his failure was due, says Horn, to the importance that he attached to the *Phaidros* as the dialogue that determined the direction of the others, and to his preconceived notion that Plato's dialogues must form together a single methodically con-

nected series. In other words, Schleiermacher's scheme was wrong and his starting-point was wrong, and yet Dr. Horn contends that Schleiermacher was at bottom right. If Plato is a profound and clear thinker and a master of style beyond compare, we must be able to deduce from his indisputably genuine writings the doctrine contained therein, with clearness and definiteness. If it is not only permissible but necessary to proceed from the presupposition that the development of Plato's thought is strictly normal, then, with the understanding of the contents, the question as to the sequence is essentially solved. These things being so, the conclusion will be: Either these writings are presentations of different parts of a completed system and show no considerable deviation from each other, in which case the question of sequence loses the greater part of its significance; or, which is the more probable, the views of Plato in the course of his long activity as a writer have undergone change and refashioning, and then, with the assumption of a normal development, there can be no doubt which is the earlier, which is the later view. If, in other words, we know exactly what Plato wants to say in a dialogue, then we know the position occupied by that dialogue in the corpus of the Platonic writings, and it follows as an inevitable corollary that a work of Plato cannot have been correctly and exhaustively explained unless its relation to the works that are of similar content is proved and has thus furnished the test for the explanation. Not as if there were a single series, comprising all the works of Plato—such a series as Schleiermacher wished to set up—but in those groups of dialogues that are mainly concerned with the same problems, certain series must result, and the comparison of these series will show in what order they follow or interlock. The achievement of this Horn justly considers not only a matter of great importance, but also as giving the sure basis for the study of the other works.

There are, he says, eight undisputed dialogues, for his list is even shorter than Schaarschmidt's: Protagoras, Gorgias, Phaidros, Symposium, Phaidon, Theaitetos, Politeia and Timaios. These are the most important for the knowledge of Plato's doctrine and style, especially so as they show the progressive development, the constant transformation and clarification of Plato's thought, by which he is not seldom made to dispute directly his previous tenets. So, for instance, the theory of virtue in the Gorgias is different from that in the Protagoras, and the doctrine of immortality in the Symposium is different from that of the Phaidros, to which he returned in Phaidon and Politeia. But in all these transformations and self-corrections we can always recognize perfectly how one of these theories has proceeded from the other, and how all of them together form the leading, the fundamental views of Plato. This, he continues, furnishes us with a canon for judging the more or less doubtful dialogues. If they fit into the frame of the undoubtedly genuine dialogues without violence, if they serve as preparations or continuations or supplements, if they serve to complete the image of Plato already acquired, without altering it in any way,—then they are to be considered, without hesitation, as genuine. Such are Laches, Lysis, Charmides, Euthydemos and Menon. On the other hand, those dialogues that cannot be explained from the fundamental views held unwaveringly by Plato in his undoubtedly genuine writings, those dialogues that are in irreconcilable

conflict with said fundamental views, must be designated as spurious, and, in Horn's opinion, such a piece of work is the *Philebos*. Of course, success depends upon conscientious limitation to the contents of the dialogue. The analyst must not enrich the substance of the dialogue by his own contributions—a simple and cardinal rule against which, in Horn's judgment, there has been much and flagrant sinning.

The groups treated by Horn are: I. *Laches*, *Protagoras*, *Gorgias*; II. *Lysis*, *Charmides*, *Euthydemos*; III. *Phaidros*, *Symposion*, *Phaidon*, with an appendix on the *Menon*, which he accepts, and the *Philebos*, which he rejects.

I have given this abstract of Horn's views, not because I have any special calling to discuss the question of the Platonic Canon, but because the bare statement shows, what closer examination would only confirm, the hopelessness of reaching a definite conclusion on any plan that involves so many factors. The language is elusive, the subject is elusive, and the author is a Proteus when he is not a mime. True, even Plato's great and vivacious intellect was subject to the inexorable laws of life, and we might postulate certain changes that usually go with advancing years; and when we note a concord in these changes we may make bold to say: This is a Plato who has lost the spring of his life, whose laughter is forced, whose smile is grim; this is a Plato whose figures are made to order and lack the spontaneity of the early love; this is a Plato whose pictures are too elaborate, whose double office of teacher and poet is no longer carried with the easy grace of perfect mastery. We may make bold to say these things as they have been said of Pindar, and we may be foolish enough to forget the return of that youth that haunts the heart and brain of supreme genius. There is a drift, there is a trend in thought, as in language, but when it comes to detail in either domain we must not be too swift to formulate. For we have to do with an artist of the keenest susceptibility and of the most playful delight in his own powers of presentation. How much is presage and prophecy, how much is after-glow, who can tell? The date of the *Phaidros* is a perpetual *ignis fatuus* to the investigator, and he who mocks at a double edition of the *Phaidros*, himself suggests a double edition of the *Theaitetos*. Nor does Horn succeed in avoiding the fatality that seems to attend the quest of this Holy Grail of Platonism. According to him, the *Phaidros* is an exaltation of the written over the spoken word, of the living teacher over the mummified sophist. It is a glorification of the career of Sokrates, who taught, and did not write, and therefore must stand early in the Platonic canon, must stand before Plato engaged in his own varied authorship. Or else, though he does not admit the dread alternative, the exaltation of the spoken over the written word, of the loving teacher over the frosty rhetorician, may mark the close of Plato's own career as an author, so that we should have in the *Phaidros* the confession of a failure and the consecration of what remained of life to the teacher's calling. Such are the alternatives of an infallible method. As for the progress of doctrine, I would only say that in the lower sphere, in which I move—the sphere of grammar and style—I should no more think of maintaining that one dialogue is later than another because Plato starts a synonym or a syntactical distinction in the one that he does not observe in the other, than I should undertake to apply to any healthy classic the minute laws of

chronological consistency by which a mechanical antiquarianism is bound. How often have we seen professed grammarians state a phenomenon correctly one year and then, by lapse of memory or other infirmity, state it falsely some years afterwards; deny the dual to Herodotos in 1869 and expound the Herodotean dual in 1870, as happened to Kühner (A. J. P. II 401); explain *worth* in 'Woe worth the day' as a verb in an earlier grammar and as an adjective in a later primer, a chance which befell, if I am not mistaken, the late Richard Morris! We cannot hold Plato the artist to the strict responsibility that some people exact of Homer. Else we shall make mince-meat of the unity, not only of the Platonic system, but of the individual dialogues. How, for instance, did Sokrates, who never went out of town, who seemed to need an Augustus Hare to conduct him through the environs of Athens,—how did he manage to reveal so accurate a knowledge of this and that feature of the landscape that Phaidros, who tramped the roads about Athens in conscientious obedience to a medical prescription, had to ask him for information? Of course, the 'inconsistency' may be explained in half a dozen ways, as, for instance, by Sokrates' schoolboy rambles, but there should be no necessity of explanation.

As to the value of a careful analysis of the dialogues of Plato as a necessary preliminary to the appreciation of the whole Platonic corpus, or, if Heaven please, to the reconstruction of a Platonic 'system,' whether that system sprang complete into life or was gradually evolved—as to the value of such an analysis there cannot be two minds. The trouble lies in the execution. Bonitz's work in this direction is admirable, and yet how much dissent it has evoked. To be objective here is impossible, for if you are objective you will not be impressionable enough to respond to Plato's shifting moods. Every one who has studied Plato at all has had to encounter this difficulty, and the independent analyses I have made from time to time, in an honest endeavor to fit myself in a measure for work in Plato, have ceased to comfort me as soon as I undertook to compare them with the results of Platonic scholars whom I felt myself bound to respect. So, instead of carping at Dr. Horn's analyses, which would be the short method of an accomplished Platonist, I actually made independent analyses of *Philebos*, *Laches* and *Charmides*, and made them as 'objectively' as was possible for me. I am sorry to say that they do not fit exactly into the lines of Horn's work. But it is not necessary to take a whole dialogue. Take a part of a dialogue. Take a limited range, such as the speeches in the *Symposion*. Which of all the many schemes of succession and contrast is the true one? Some years ago I attempted to make a ring out of these separate gems, for, in an attack of the *Schleiermacherian* spirit, I refused to believe that they were 'orient pearls at random strung,' and I even dared to print a little paper (*J. H. U. Circulars*, No. 55, January, 1887) in which I reproduced the complex which these wonderful discourses made to my mind. I do not flatter myself that I succeeded in getting any one else to occupy my angle of vision. What is Orion's belt to one nationality is Our Lady's Ellwand to another, and the same thing is true of the Platonic constellations and of individual students. So Horn has a chapter on the subject of the speeches in the *Symposion*, but Horn brings me no comfort. In short, when the unphilosophical soul is brought into the presence of Plato he has

but to behold and wonder. But wonder is a good beginning, as Plato himself would say. It is at least the threshold.

In what has been said about the difficulty of Dr. Horn's task there has been no desire to detract from the merit of his studies, which seem to me unusually suggestive and instructive—and the fact that this notice has swollen from a brief sentence of acknowledgment to its present compass must be considered a manner of tribute to the interest which Dr. Horn has managed to arouse in one who must perforce confine himself to the literary side of Plato. Mr. Pater's volume, on the other hand, would seem, at first, to be intended more for the student of Plato as a poet than for the student of Plato as a thinker; but one cannot divorce Plato the artist from Plato the philosopher, and Mr. Pater's Plato and Platonism has been enthusiastically welcomed not only by literary people, but by those who are recognized interpreters of the spirit of Plato. In one or two journals, it is true, there has been a mild protest against the liberties that Mr. Pater has taken with his authorities, and in the September number of the Educational Review Professor Seymour has not hesitated to point out some of the blunders that disfigure the fascinating book; but most of the critics, not having about them the philological *moly*, seem to have fallen under the Circean spell of Mr. Pater's style, and to have surrendered absolutely to Pater and Paterism. Indeed, while reading one of these enthusiastic notices, I could not keep from exclaiming: *ἡγούμενος σὲ μᾶλλον ἢ ἐμὲ ἐπαίειν περὶ τῶν τοιούτων σοὶ εἰπόμεν καὶ ἐπόμενος συνεβάκχενσα μετὰ σοῦ τῆς θείας κεφαλῆς*. And yet—and yet—I hope I shall be pardoned for saying that my enjoyment would have been heightened if some mousing owl of a grammarian had exterminated a few of the small deer in Mr. Pater's proofsheets. Carelessness in these minor matters breeds distrust. Chaignet, for instance, 'professeur de littérature ancienne' and author of a work on Plato's psychology that has been crowned by the French Academy, irritates the schoolmaster soul by his false accents, and Mr. Pater is even worse. Not only does he maltreat the accents, which some still consider a small matter, but he puts an enclitic at the head of a sentence, construes *ἀκολουθεῖν* with the accusative, writes *ἡ διαίτα Δωρικὴ* as if Greek were French, and with a clear poetical *δέ τε* before him, allows Plato to fool him into quoting a verse as if it were prose. That is a very common Platonic trick, but a Platonic scholar ought to have been on his guard against his master's mischief. However,

*πολλοὶ μὲν νερθηκοφόροι παῖροι δέ τε βάκχοι.*

Still, no one with any degree of literary sensibility can be proof against Mr. Pater's attractive way of putting things, and there is an undeniable charm in seeing the veriest commonplaces of Platonic study lighted up by the poetic genius of Mr. Pater; but commonplaces are after all commonplaces, and a whole chapter of Mr. Pater's may be packed in a simple, short sentence of some approved manual. Nor is Mr. Pater's style at its best in this book. Marius, the Epicurean, was a more congenial theme than Plato and Platonism. It may be that the necessary comparison with Plato himself is an inevitable disadvantage; it may be that the strong masculine personality of Sokrates is a serious drawback. The long Platonic periods are instinct with life, and Sokrates hits out from the shoulder. Mr. Pater is too languid for the com-

pany he keeps, and his perpetual 'Well!' has the tone of refined condescension, not of Socratic *bonhomie*. His translations from Plato might well form the subject of a special notice, as it is he, according to Professor Shorey (A. J. P. XIII 352), who should have redeemed us from Jowett's provoking 'neatness and crispness'; but the book hardly falls within the province of this Journal, at any rate, and one specimen of Mr. Pater's style must serve to show the *bric-à-brac* character of his illustrations:—

"A certain penitential colour amid that glow of fancy and expression, hints that the final harmony of his nature had been but gradually beaten out, and invests the temperance, actually so conspicuous in his own nature, with the charms of a patiently elaborated effect of art" (p. 121).

Poor Plato has had many things to suffer at the hands of the critics, by reason of the 'barkeeper' figure in the Laws (VI 773 D), but what he means is clear enough, whereas Mr. Pater's figure will be a perpetual puzzle to those who are not familiar with the processes of metallurgy to which he refers. One can readily foresee that when the classics of the nineteenth century are edited, this passage will evoke as elaborate a commentary as that which has gathered about the *χαλκοῦ βαφάς* of the Agamemnon.

B. L. GILDERSLEEVE.

---

The Church Slavonic Elements in the Modern Literary and Popular Russian Language (Cerkovnoslavjanskije Elementy v Sovremennom Literaturnom i Narodnom Russkom Jazykje), by S. BULIČ. Part I. St. Petersburg, 1893. [Memoirs of the Historico-Philological Faculty of the Imperial University at St. Petersburg, Part XXXII.]

Less than ten years ago Hugo Schuchardt boldly enunciated his theory, "es gibt keine völlig ungemischte Sprache," in opposition to M. Müller's dictum, "es gibt keine Mischsprache," at the same time asserting that language mixture is the most important question that confronts modern linguistic science. H. Paul's first edition of the 'Principien der Sprachgeschichte' was out, and Schuchardt justly complained that no place had been given in it to this question; in his second edition Paul corrected the mistake by inserting a chapter on language-mixture, doubtless under the influence of this new impetus. The activity thus roused in the linguistic field has produced some excellent fruit, but no work can compare in thoroughness and importance with the one before us. In an introduction of 56 pages the author summarizes all that has been done towards the understanding of the phenomena of language-mixture, adding to it copious illustrations of a similar process in Slavonic and Russian. In connection with this Bulič ably criticises Schleicher's categories of *Lehnwörter* and *Fremdwörter* and the essentially identical division by Prof. Tobler. According to them, words that passed into the language from a foreign idiom at an early period, so that phonetic changes have made them familiar to the ear, belong to the first class, while late introductions of unusual sound must be regarded as *Fremdwörter*. This classification suffers from serious defects. The author exemplifies it in the word *strubcynka* ('Schraubenzwinge'), which cannot be

regarded as foreign, since its identity with the German word is not apparent, nor as belonging to the first division, since the second part (*cynka*) sounds un-Russian. Turkic words such as *kaftan*, *kazak*, on the contrary, pass for pure native words, although they have preserved their original form. In view of these facts, Bulič says: "The strange impression produced by foreign words depends on three causes: the incomprehensibility of their roots, their consequently isolated position, and their rarer use. The last is the most potent one. The present method of dividing words into Lehnwörter and Fremdwörter suffers from subjectivity and from the unavoidable absence of scientific exactness; the associative relation between the members of separate semasiological and etymological groups, and the determination of frequency of such members, must be studied and reduced to more or less exact formulae before correct classification can be attempted."

It was known to many before Bulič that Church Slavonic played an important part in the formation of literary Russian, and the more apparent phonetic Slavonisms are correctly stated by Bodouin de Courtenais, but no one before him has made a thorough investigation of the subject. The real relation of Church Slavonic to Old Slavonic has never been exactly understood. In this first volume the author makes a minute investigation into the extent of the decay of the older forms, and of the Russian influences which helped to modify the older language; the second volume will doubtless contain the direct exposition of the main subject as indicated in the title.

The first chapter contains a detailed critical analysis of all previous works on Church Slavonic, from Žizanj and Smotricki in the sixteenth century to Buslajev and Bodouin de Courtenais in our own times. The small residue of any worth is separated from the dross of subjective speculations; this task elicits his words: "The present chapter relieves us from the duty of referring to earlier works, and attests our good will to make use of all real literary material."

His investigations are based on the texts of the Bible of the Russian revision: the Ostrožski (1581), the Editio Princeps of Moscow (1663), and the New, a reprint of the Empress Elisabeth revision of 1751. The older Skorina Bible he rejects as being a curious mixture of Church Slavonic, Polish, White Russian and Bohemian. All other Church Slavonic works follow closely the Bible texts, hence need not be considered.

Phonetic and morphological analogies with Great Russian account for the deviations from the older language. Little Russian comes in for its share of phonetic influence in the pronunciation of *g* as a voiced velar spirant (*ɣ*), and in the preservation of accented *z* preceding an unpalatalized consonant, where Russian has changed it to *ž*; this is explained by the fact that most religious teachers came from Kiev, and that the pronunciation of a book-language is assimilated to the conditions of the living idiom. Following similar influences, Ch. Slavonic has lost the nasality of its vowels, reducing them to the corresponding Russian vowels. *ǫ* (sign of non-palatalization) has the zero of sound, *ʲ* indicates palatalization. The combinations *rǫ*, *rʲ*, *lǫ*, *lʲ* are changed, as in Russian, to *or*, *er*, *ol*, *el* (?); *rje*, *lje* remain unchanged; so do *ra*, *la*, while in Russian the latter become *oro*, *olo*. Most consonants follow the same influence: palatalization is extended to *k*, *g*, *χ*, while *ž*, *ʒ*, *c* lose it. The historical

relation of the first group to O. Slavonic is, however, preserved in the intermediate softening of *k, g, χ*, under the influence of palatalization, to *z, c, s* respectively. O. Slavonic correspondents to *tj, dj* (*kt, gt, χt*) are preserved, but with a changed pronunciation. Changes of Ch. Slavonic *ŷč'* and *žd* to the corresponding Russian *č* and *ž* are rare. O. Sl. *št* changing to Ch. Sl. *ŷč'* is explained by the case where it represents prim. *skj* before palatal vowels, which was then extended to cases where it represents prim. *tj, kt, gt*; this was, presumably, aided by the use of the ligature for *št*, disguising the original combination. The pronunciation *ŷč'* before non-palatal vowels is due to a secondary development: *žd* before non-palatals preserved its original pronunciation, the absence of a ligature recalling to mind the real value of the sound: before palatal vowels it becomes *ždž* or *žd'*; this again is explained as a development of prim. *ždj* or *žgj*.

The remaining 250 pages deal with the morphological peculiarities of Ch. Slavonic; here again we see the destructive influence of the living Russian and the action of morphological assimilation. Only a few examples can be cited here. The declensional endings are wavering between the older forms and Russian, and Smotricki's multiplicity of forms is shown to be an attempt at graphic differentiation only: the *u*-declension tends to become identical with that in *o*, the *ā* with that in *i*, etc. The personal endings of the verbs follow the same Russifying tendency. The forms of the dual are instructive, as their comparatively rare use led the revisers to odd mistakes. The first person of O. Slavonic dual *-vje* is substituted by *va* and *ma*, while Smotricki differentiates them as to genders into *ma* and *mje*, *va* and *vje*. *Va* and *vje* is evidently due to an assimilation to such nominal forms as *dva brata, dvje rucje*, while *ma, mje* shows the influence of the first person plural. Similarly, the second and third persons are given as *ta, tje*; the forms are frequently substituted by those of the plural. The second person of secondary tenses is restricted in its use, the compound form (e. g. *vidjel jesi*) being used instead. The verb does not appreciably differ from the older form in its classification of conjugations. The number of participial forms is increased, the simpler ones giving way by degrees to the complex, more Russian forms. The simple aorist of Leskien's classification has almost entirely disappeared; the first complex aorist is generally abandoned for the second. The periphrastic expressions are fairly well preserved; the auxiliary verb is frequently omitted, as in Russian; the future is formed as in O. Slavonic or as in Russian.

These scanty examples may, perhaps, give an idea of the scope of the work. We look forward with great expectations to the second volume.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI, COLUMBIA, MO.

LEO WIENER.

## REPORTS.

NEUE JAHRBÜCHER FÜR PHILOGIE UND PAEDAGOGIK, 1891.

Fascicle 10.

81. Pp. 657-84. A. Fleckeisen discusses a number of passages of Plautus and Terence. I. Plautus, Aul. 701, *pici*, the reading of the latest editions, should give way to the MS *picis* = *φίκας* or *πίκας* (= *σφίγγας*, Hesych.). The use of the word is due to a not unnatural confusion of the *γρύπες*, who were the *χρυσοφύλακες* (*qui aureos montes colunt*, *ibid.*), and the *φίκας* or *σφίγγες*, a confusion to which Isidorus gives testimony, Orig. XX 11, 3: *spingae sunt in quibus sunt spingatae effigies, quos nos gryphos dicimus*. He would further transpose thus: *divitiis picis*, etc. Excursus (*Auslauf*, to the justification of which term a considerable note is devoted) on Plato's Cratylus, 414 d, where for the vulgate *ὥσπερ καὶ τὴν σφίγγα ἀντὶ φεγγὸς σφίγγα καλοῦσιν* should be read *ἀντὶ σφίγγος φῖγα καλοῦσιν*.—II. Casina, prol. 61, MSS and editors from Merula to Schöll read *impedimento*, regardless of the true quantity. Fleckeisen restores it by omission of *et*, thus: *eandem illam amare, esse impedimentó sibi*. Consideration of this passage leads him incidentally to emendations of Ter. H. T. 601 and 933, and Phormio 598. Returning to the Casina, he suggests the following reading for prol. 48 f.: *placere posset eam puellam <et> hic senex || ama<vi>t ecclitum et item <adultus> filius*. In prol. 55 he transposes, reading *adlegat armigerum*, and vs. 72 he reads thus: *et hic in nostra fieri terra Apulia*.—III. The adjective form *scelerus* = *scelestus*, *scelerosus*, reported by Servius ad Aen. IX 484, along with *funerus* = *funereus*, is defended against the objections of Sauppe, and is recognized accordingly in Pseudolus 817, quoted by Servius, and restored to Andria 786, Adelphi 159 (to transform the objectionable iambic line into a trochaic septenarius), Mostel. 504, and Rudens 456 (in the last three instances to take the place of the unmetrical *scelestus* of the MSS).—IV. Attention is called to the difficulty of giving a satisfactory interpretation to the phrase *lectulos in sole ilignis pedibus* in Adelphi 585, and the inadequacy of Bentley's explanation is shown. An emendation by Leclerc (Clericus 1712) to *lectulos illi salignis pedibus* is communicated and defended palaeographically and by reference to Ovid, Met. VIII 656. In Heaut. Tim. 147 Fleckeisen transposes, reading *me tantisper*, and in 148 he reads (following Madvig) *vivam miser* for *fiam miser*.

82. Pp. 685-8. O. Meltzer (Zur vorgegeschichte des dritten punischen Kriegs) calls attention to the fact that among the conditions imposed upon the Carthaginians by the Romans (Diod. 32, 6. 3; Liv. perioch. 49) as terms of surrender, the one pertaining to the rebuilding of their city agrees curiously with the teaching of Plato concerning the ideal location of a state, viz. that it shall be at least 80 stadia from the sea-coast (Leges 704 b). The conclusion which is drawn from this coincidence is, that when the efforts of

the party of tolerance toward Carthage to prevent the destruction of the city were of no avail, they suggested this condition as a compromise, and in naming the specifications concerning a possible future site were influenced by the Platonic doctrine, with which Scipio Nasica at least may have been familiar.

83. Pp. 689-706. H. Magnus presents the first of a series of critical studies on the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid. I. Fragmentum Bernense. A description of the MS and a new collation of the Ovid portions by H. Hagen is presented, correcting and completing the earlier collations by Hagen and Ellis. The question which Magnus proposes is, whether the frag. B. goes back to the same archetype as the complete MSS or not, and he comes to the conclusion that it does not, but represents an older and purer text, quite independent of them. Results of some importance for the emendation of the text of Ovid are thus reached.

(51.) Pp. 706-7. O. Linsenbarth collects a number of passages from ancient writers to support the correctness of Virgil's observation concerning the food of the ant in the well-known passage *Aen.* IV 402.

84. P. 707. F. Polle, on Cicero, *C. M.* §68.

85. Pp. 708-12. G. Friedrich discusses the parabasis in the *Curculio* of Plautus (462-86). It is conceded that either 472 or 485 is spurious, but, contrary to the view of Jordan and Goetz, he would eliminate 472, chiefly on the ground that a basilica did not exist in Rome at that time. Vs. 485, transposed with the preceding and emended (*quaerito* for *Oppiam* is suggested), should then stand in the text.

86. Pp. 713-16. W. Schwarz interprets *Potamophylacia* in *CIL.* II 1970 as the Latin transliteration of a Greek word *ποταμοφυλακεία*, meaning the police oversight of the river (Nile), a task which might well have been entrusted to a special officer, whose duty it would be not only to police the river, but also to administer the collection of tolls at the various stations (*φυλακή, σκεδία*). It is not surprising that the holder of such an office should also have been *praefectus classis Alexandrinae* (*ibid.*).

87. P. 716. E. Dittrich, on Propertius, IV 2.

88. Pp. 717-36. W. Liebenam (*Bemerkungen zur Tradition über Germanicus*) discusses the view of the character of Germanicus presented by Tacitus, and his relation to Tiberius. He observes that the facts as narrated by Tacitus give no sufficient warrant for his assertion that a relation of hostility and mutual distrust existed between Tiberius and Germanicus. The origin of this view, he suggests, is to be found in the contrast between the characters and the appearance of the two men, which was interpreted by popular judgment after the death of Germanicus as representing a deep-seated jealousy—a view to which additional color of truth was given by the banishment of Agrippina. Following this tradition, Tacitus constructs his whole history of Germanicus upon the assumed hostility of Tiberius to him, in the manner of a tragic drama, in which the hero saves the throne for the emperor who seeks to destroy him. In accordance with this view, the history of the mutiny of

the legions on the Rhine is examined, and it is found that the real causes of the uprising are suppressed, and that it is made to appear as a revolt of the army against Tiberius, in favor of Germanicus. That many of the facts in detail were not quite as related by Tacitus, the author seeks to show by intimations of Tacitus himself as well as from other sources, and he explains the peculiar coloring that they have received in Tacitus's narrative by the popular tradition concerning Germanicus already referred to.

(32.) P. 736. H. Deiter, critical observations on *Caes. B. G. VII* 74. 1; *VIII* 36. 1.

Fascicle II.

89. Pp. 737-50. H. Düntzer, on the *Προμηθεὺς πυρφόρος* of Aeschylus, maintains the correctness of Welcker's view (at present generally discredited under the influence of Westphal's criticisms) that this drama was the first of the Prometheus trilogy, and presents his conception of its character and contents.

90. Pp. 750-1. F. Polle, exegetical observation on Dem. de pace, §24.

91. Pp. 751-2. O. Höfer, a couple of critical notes on Eusebius *παρασκευὴ εὐαγγελτική*.

92. P. 752. E. Dittrich restores to metrical form a fragment of the hymn of Euanthes to Glaucus, preserved in the prose of Athenaeus (206 c).

93. Pp. 753-66. F. Lüders gives 'marginal notes' of linguistic, geographical and literary-historical character on the first four books of Xenophon's *Anabasis* (some valuable parallels).

94. Pp. 767-8. K. J. Liebhold, critical notes on three passages of Plato's *Gorgias*.

95. Pp. 769-75. G. Knaack, observations on a number of the poets of the Greek Anthology and certain of their epigrams.

96. Pp. 775-8. E. Goebel, some critical notes on Homer.

97. Pp. 779-92. K. Manitius calls attention to the almost forgotten commentary of Hipparchus, the astronomer, to the *Phaenomena* of Aratus and Eudoxus. The contents of the work are set forth in considerable detail, and emendations to the text, arrived at chiefly by means of a globe so arranged, or set back, as to reproduce the rising and setting of the stars and constellations in Hipparchus' time, are communicated. The text is found to bear traces of revision, carried through more or less intelligently.

98. P. 792. E. Dittrich, critical note on the scholia to Apollonius's *Argonautica*, I 38.

(88.) Pp. 793-810. W. Liebenam continues his discussion of Tacitus's account of Germanicus, and takes up next his description of the campaigns in Germany. He calls attention to the uncertain character of topographical and chronological data as given by Tacitus, in spite of much detail, although, as he points out, this is only in accordance with Roman methods of historical research and composition. Faithful to one of the avowed aims of the *Annals*,

*ne virtutes sileantur*, Tacitus sketches in the person of Germanicus an ideal picture of a successful commander, which is not, however, without improbable touches of rhetorical fiction. The successes of the Romans are magnified, their losses passed over in silence or excused. The Germans, whose valor and discipline are so warmly praised in the Germania, are here represented as a race of cowards, slothful and untrained. In general, rhetorical display is peculiarly manifest in this portion of the Annals. Concerning the recall of Germanicus, Tacitus recognizes but one motive, the jealousy and envy of Tiberius, although indications are not lacking to show that there was good ground for dissatisfaction with Germanicus. For instance, contrary to the general principles of Tiberius's foreign policy, Germanicus had inaugurated an aggressive and offensive warfare in Germany which could only have been justified by great successes. Since these did not follow, it was only right that emphasis should be laid upon the correctness of the emperor's judgment by recalling in formal manner the commander who had ventured to inaugurate a policy of his own.

(75.) P. 816. H. Lewy makes some additions to the article of B. Schmidt (Ancient formulae of imprecation, A. J. P. XIV 2) from German popular superstition and from the Old Testament.

Fascicle 12.

99. Pp. 818-22. C. Rüger, critical notes on the Ps.-Dem. speech cont. *Euerg. et Mnesibul.* (XLVII).

(10.) P. 822. K. J. Liebhold, on Xen. Mem. III 10. 12.

100. Pp. 823-8. P. Schulze examines the work *περί ὀρχήσεως*, attributed to Lucian, with regard to its contents, purpose and language, and comes to the conclusion (already arrived at by Bekker and Sommerbrodt) that it cannot be genuine.

101. Pp. 829-47. R. Klotz presents a metrical study (1) of the argument and prologue, and (2) of the cantica of the Casina of Plautus. Concerning the cantica, he holds that the MSS present more often than is believed the correct division of the lines, displaying an extraordinary variety of metrical forms and confirming his views of the art of the Roman dramatists in this respect, as set forth in his work 'Grundzüge altrömischer Metrik' (Leipzig, 1890).

102. Pp. 848-50. M. Kiderlin, critical notes on Quintilian, book IX.

(37.) Pp. 851-5. J. Netušil discusses the formulation of the rules for conditional sentences, and suggests that in addition to the usual three forms (indicative, potential and unreal) a fourth class, which he would call the 'fictive form,' be recognized to comprehend imaginary or postulated suppositions, as, for instance, *si quis deus largiatur, recusem*, in which an apparent confusion of the potential and unreal condition is frequently found. But in such conditions the pres. subj. is used with reference to present time, the impf. subj. with reference to past.

103. P. 856. C. Häberlin, in Sid. Apol. epist. VIII 11 reads *in bucolica Virgilians* (MSS *vigilanz*).

(33.) Pp. 857-64. F. Knoke discusses the *locus vexatus*, Germania, 2, 16, and comes to the conclusion that *a victore* is used of the Romans, and *ob metum* of the fear with which the Germans had inspired the Gauls, i. e. *ob metum Gallorum ex Germanis*.

(88.) Pp. 865-88. W. Liebenam continues his discussion of Tacitus's account of Germanicus, taking up for the concluding paper his *imperium* in the East. The ground for the hostility of Piso to Germanicus is to be found in the conduct of the latter, and not in secret efforts of Tiberius looking toward their alienation. This final scene in the life of Germanicus reveals the same dramatic conception to which attention has already been called, and to it historical truth has certainly been sacrificed not a little. Concerning the source of Tacitus, it is impossible for us to arrive at any final results. Certainly there was less divergence among his authorities for the events of the life of Germanicus than for most other events treated in the Annals. This peculiarity of Tacitus's account seems to indicate that Germanicus is portrayed in the lines given to his character by the tradition of the people, whose idol he was. The growth of the tradition, however, we cannot follow. The criticisms which have been presented affect, therefore, rather the historiography of antiquity than the *fides historica* of Tacitus.

GEORGE L. HENDRICKSON.

---

REVUE DE PHILOGIE. Vol. XVI.

No. 1.

I. Pp. 1-17. Biographical sketch of O. Riemann, by Émile Chatelain. Othon Riemann was born at Nancy, June 23, 1853, and died Aug. 16, 1891, from the effects of a terrible fall on the Morgenberg seven days before. Having graduated at the *lycée* of Nancy (1870), he studied with brilliant success in the *École normale supérieure*, and in 1874 he was made a member of the French School of Athens. The first year was to be spent in Italy. He devoted this time to the libraries of various cities, where he collated the MSS of Livy and did other work. His influence on the schools of Athens and Rome was felt from the start. During his second year he produced several important works. He was then entrusted with the archaeological exploration of the Ionian isles, and made a voluminous report. Returning to France in 1877, he occupied a chair in grammar in the *École supérieure* at Nancy. In 1879 he submitted his dissertation to the *Faculté des lettres* de Paris, and received his doctorate. His dissertation was a double one, consisting of (1) a discussion of the sources of the text of Xenophon's *Hellenica*, and (2) a treatise on the language and grammar of Livy. In 1880 he became one of the editors of the *Revue de Philologie*, having been since 1878 *Rédacteur général* of Greece for the *Revue des Revues* appended to the *Rev. d. Philologie*. In 1881 he was called to Paris by the *Faculté des lettres* as being the most competent scholar in France to defend and strengthen pure philology against the threatening inroads of comparative grammar. During this same year he succeeded Thurot in the chair of grammar at the *École normale* without at once resigning that which he

already held. In 1885 he was unanimously called to a chair in the École des hautes-études, retaining his place in the École normale. Six years and a half after this came the terrible catastrophe; but in this brief space he accomplished more than the usual work of a lifetime. His books, original articles, and reviews numbered in all one hundred and fifty-one. A complete list of them is given by Chatelain. From 1884 to 1888 he assisted in editing the *Revue de l'enseignement secondaire et de l'enseignement supérieur*.

The works of Riemann are of the highest order. His 'Syntaxe latine' contains a great number of new facts and personal results. He was no less competent as a Greek grammarian, and assisted Tournier in the preparation of his 'Premiers éléments de grammaire grecque.' Many of his articles, published in the *Revue de Philologie* and elsewhere, contain important contributions to Latin and Greek grammar. His critical work on Livy was in such demand among the scholars of the world that a second edition was called for—a rare fortune for a doctor-dissertation, even in France, where the grade is very high. It is not possible, however, to give an account here of all his works.

But perhaps even more important was his influence as a teacher. His many pupils, now scattered over France and other countries, have carried with them his scientific method and his zeal for true philology. The fruitfulness of his instruction is ascribed, in great part, to the fact that his philological attainments did not form an oasis in the midst of a desert of general ignorance; but he possessed a good knowledge of contiguous subjects, by means of which he kept his labors in touch with the rest of the great world of literature and science.

He was of a modest, retiring disposition. He never for a moment made any display of his great attainments; nor did he ever seek notoriety by popularizing the results of his investigations or those of others. He was unwilling to do any work unless he believed that he could thereby contribute something to human knowledge.

His portrait appears as a frontispiece to this number of the *Revue*.

2. P. 17. Paul Thomas proposes *bonorum* for the second *vivorum* in Cic. de Leg. II 17. 44.

3. Pp. 18-34. Latin notes by Paul Lejay. I. He attempts to remove *nasus* from the exceptions to rhotacism by showing from inscriptions that this word was pronounced *nassus*. Compare *caussa* and *causa*. In that case *nares* would show a double formation. The inscriptions quoted deal chiefly with proper names formed on the stem *nas(s)o-*.

II. *Litteratura*, denoting *profane* literature, as opposed to *scriptura*, is shown to have probably originated from Ps. lxx. 15, with the reading *γραμματαίος* of B<sup>ab</sup> N (for *πραγματίας* BR), whence the Vulgate *litteraturam*. Strange to say, the sentence in which it occurs is an interpolation.

III. *Refert* and *interest* = 'it concerns' are discussed. From a history of the usage the following conclusions are drawn: 1. *Refert* is the more ancient. 2. *Refert* alone is employed by the poets to the end of the classical period. 3. *Interest* is peculiar to prose, exclusively employed by Caesar, and chosen by Cicero when a complement is added. The constructions of *refert* and *interest* are derived from *refert mea*. When *interest mea* was formed after its analogy,

the step to *interest Caesaris* was easy; and from this was finally produced *refert Caesaris*. [The author fails to note that *interest*, except in the subjunctive, could not be used in dactylic metres.]

IV. *Qui et* (without verb) adding a sobriquet to a name in inscriptions is illustrated by many classified examples. The relative, though always (?) in the nominative, often has an oblique case after it, when the same case precedes, as *Iuventi qui et Efractoris*. In very few examples a genitive follows though a nominative precedes. [In two of the examples as printed, *cui et* appears between datives. On this the author makes no remark.] Sometimes *q. et* is written.

4. Pp. 35-9. On Andocides *Πρὸς τοὺς ἑταίρους*, by H. Micheli. This lost speech is mentioned only in *Plut. Them.* 32. Two fragments (*Suidas*, s. v. *Σκάνδις*; *Schol. ad Aristoph. Vesp.* 1007) are assigned to it by Kirchhoff. The author accepts these, but rejects the conclusions of K., and conjectures that the oration was originally entitled *Κατ' Ἀλκιβιάδου πρὸς τοὺς ἑταίρους*, and that this became confounded with the anonymous oration *Κατ' Ἀλκιβιάδου* referred to in *Plut. Alcib.* 13, so that both for a time bore the name of Andocides, and finally the genuine oration was dropped and lost.

5. P. 39. Note on the origin of the Italian recension of Plautus, by Paul Lejay.

6. Pp. 40-41. In *Hirt. de Bello Gal.* VIII, *Prooe.* 2, S. Dosson shows that *cohaerentibus* (also *comparantibus*, *comparentibus*, *comparandis*, *comparandos* in MSS) should very probably be *competentibus*.

7. Pp. 42-8. Critical notes on Greek works on Alchemy, by Paul Tannery.

8. Pp. 49-56. On Sallust the Philosopher, by Franz Cumot. Some have maintained that the author of the book entitled *Σαλοναστίου φιλοσόφου περὶ θεῶν καὶ κόσμου* was Flavius Sallustius, the friend of Julian. Wilamowitz, on the contrary, holds that he was the grammarian Sallustius, who composed the arguments to the *Antigone* and *Oedipus Rex*. Cumot brings strong evidences in favor of the former view. He shows incidentally that the title of the book is arbitrary, resting on no real authority. The article closes with a collation of the one extant MS with the edition of Orelli.

9. Pp. 57-9. Notes on Herodotus, by O. Navarre. I. Herodotus twice (*I* 106 and 184) refers to his *Ἀσσίριοι λόγοι*, which are not found in his work. Aristotle (*Hist. An.* VIII 18) seems to refer to this treatise, but some have insisted upon reading *Ἡσίοδος* for *Ἡρόδοτος*. Navarre shows that the former cannot be correct. II. He then discusses, as a distinct subject, the question whether Herodotus merely forgot to fulfil at the proper places certain promises he makes in his history, or never completed his work; and he shows that the latter is the case.

10. Pp. 60-71. On the imperfect and pluperfect subjunctive with *quom* in narrative propositions, by Otto Keller. The views of Hale and of Hoffmann, though diametrically opposite to each other, are both rejected. Keller finds the cause of this illogical use of the subjunctive in a sort of preference or taste for the subjunctive, and thinks that the frequency of *quom* narrative in

indirect discourse in official documents contributed to the establishment of this particular illogical use of that mood. He illustrates his theory of a tendency to or preference for particular modes of expressions, by many examples in various languages. [This *précis* is intended only to call attention to the article. To be understood, the whole article should be read.]

11. Pp. 72-7. Critical notes on seven passages of Plautus, by Louis Havet. These notes (in which are emended Capt. 1021, 1024, Men. 82, 85, 89, 92 and 94, 105) merit careful attention.

12. Pp. 78-80. Book Notices. (1). P. W. Forchhammer, *Prolegomena zur Mythologie als Wissenschaft und Lexicon der Mythensprache*, is totally condemned by Ch. Michel. (2). J. van der Vliet, *Studia Ecclesiastica. Tertullianus. I. Critica et interpretatoria*. P. L. points out some unimportant imperfections, and otherwise commends the work. (3). Max Freudenthal, *Die Erkenntnisslehre Philo's von Alexandria*. F. C. finds this a valuable work, but not without faults. (4). *Les noms gaulois chez César et chez Hirtius, De bello Gallico*, par H. d'Arbois de Jubainville, avec la collaboration de MM. E. Ernault et G. Dottin. Première série. Highly commended by L. D. (5). *Essai d'étymologie historique et géographique*, par Charles Toubin. Pronounced by L. D. a 'chef-d'œuvre d'extravagance.' (6). C. O. Zuretti, *Sui Dialetti litterari greci*. Pronounced by J. Bérard an ingenious work, but without plan.

#### No. 2.

1. Pp. 81-95. On oculists' stamps and works on stones (*lapidaires*) of antiquity and the early middle ages, by F. de Mély. The author takes up the special case of ophthalmia, and elucidates the oculists' stamps by means of the treatises on stones. He presents a list of eighty-nine materials used in preparing eye-salves, and identifies nineteen of them as stones. The article contains several details that are novel and interesting, especially for those concerned with the history of medicine.

2. Pp. 96-8. Note on the great Mithraic bas-relief of the Louvre and a stone found at Tivoli, by Franz Cumot. The stone does not prove, as has been supposed, that the words inscribed on the great bas-relief are all ancient, for it is evident that the former is copied after the latter, and the ignorant copyist reproduced the words that had been scratched on the relief by tourists.

3. Pp. 99-100. In Thuc. VII 71. 7, Paul Fournier and L. Gosselin defend the reading of Vaticanus *ξυμφορῶν* (for *ξυμπασῶν*), but retain *ἐλάσσων* (instead of the *ἐλασσον* of V.).

4. P. 100. Louis Havet shows that we should write *legerupa*.

5. Pp. 101-2. Cic. de Legg. III 10. 24, emended by Paul Thomas.

6. Pp. 103-8. Critical notes on Plautus (Men. 98, 155, 156 f., 180 f., 184-8, 202), by L. Havet.

7. Pp. 109-13. Notes on Lucr. de Rer. Nat. II 624 ff., Hor. Carm. I 2. 21 ff., 4. 5 ff., 4. 16 f., by Louis Duvau.

8. Pp. 113-16. Book Notices. (1). Émile Egger, *La Littérature grecque*, Paris, 1890. Commended by Albert Martin. The work is posthumous, and

is composed of distinct essays on twenty-five subjects connected with Greek literature. (2). *Zenonis Citiensis de rebus physicis doctrinae fundamentum ex adjectis fragmentis constituit* Karl Troost. G. Rodier pronounces this a useful contribution to the history of Stoicism, and points out some minor faults. (3). *Grundriss zu Vorlesungen über die Geschichte und Encyclopädie der klassischen Philologie*, von E. Hübner. 2te vermehrte Auflage. Berlin, 1889. Reviewed by J. Keelhoff. The reviewer recognizes Hübner's great reputation, but thinks it necessary on that very account to point out a number of minor inaccuracies and what he considers to be serious omissions in the provinces of grammar,<sup>1</sup> literature and history.

No. 3.

1. Pp. 117-36. On the anapaestic systems in Greek tragedy, by Paul Masqueray. An idea of the scope of this interesting investigation can be obtained from the following analysis, which is that of the author: Introductory remarks. Origin of anapaestic systems. I. Anapaests accompanying a choric or scenic movement. 1. The anapaest and the parodos. 2. The anapaest and the exodos. 3. The anapaest and the entrance of actors. 4. The anapaest and the exit of actors.—II. The anapaest not accompanying any movement. 1. Anapaests as prelude to a stasimon. 2. Anapaests as close of a kommos. 3. Anapaests as epirrhema of a kommos. a) Epirrhema and antepirrhema antistrophic. β) Not antistrophic. 4. Anapaests in reflections of the coryphaeos. 5. Anapaests in dialogues between two actors or between an actor and the coryphaeos.

2. P. 136. In *Lucr. de Rer. Nat. II 355*, Louis Duvau reads *novit humi*, etc.

3. Pp. 137-9. Paul Tannery discusses fifteen passages in *Martianus Capella Lib. VII.*

4. Pp. 140-5. Georges Lafaye presents an instructive discussion of *Catul. lxiv, 129 mollia nudatae tollentem tegmina surae*, in which the poet is fully acquitted of the charge of making his heroine, in her frantic despair, think about keeping her skirts out of the water. The attitude ascribed to her here is that found in literature and art everywhere, and was habitual, in fact, when women had to move rapidly on foot, or perform any act requiring freedom of the limbs. Even the singular *surae* is literal and correct.

5. Pp. 146-8. Otto Keller discusses *Tac. Agric., chap. 17 (end) and chap. 9 (elegit)*.

6. Pp. 149-55. The question 'Was Pliny the Elder present at the siege of Jerusalem by Titus' discussed by Philippe Fabia. The instructive investigation leads to an affirmative answer.

7. Pp. 156-60. Book Notices. (1). The Etymologies in the Servian Commentary to Vergil, by Wilfrid P. Mustard. L. D. finds this work faultless, but useless. (2). N. Novosadsky, *Du culte des Cabires dans la Grèce antique*. Favorably criticised by S. Guintowt. (3). The Isthmian Odes of Pindar, edited with introduction and commentary by J. B. Bury. J. Keelhoff regrets

<sup>1</sup> Hübner says in his Preface, p. v: "Für die griechische Syntax und die lateinische Grammatik konnte auf des Verf. übrige Grundrisse verwiesen werden."—B. L. G.

that so much science and labor have produced so meagre results. "M. Bury eût pu rendre un grand service à la philologie anglaise en continuant l'excellente édition commencée par Gildersleeve." Of the latter he adds: "Pour ceux qui commencent l'étude de Pindare, rien ne saurait remplacer ce livre."

(4). Problèmes musicaux d'Aristote. Traduction française avec commentaire perpétuel, par Ch.-Em. Ruelle. Very favorably mentioned by  $\phi$ . (5). K. Masner, Die Sammlung antiker Vasen und Terracotten im k. k. oesterreich. Museum. Vienna, C. Gerold, 1892. Described and highly commended by T. Antonesco.

#### No. 4.

1. Pp. 161-6. A few unpublished fragments of Julian, and some other matters relating to him, discussed by Franz Cumot.

2. P. 167. Note by B. Haussoulier on the 'Hundred Heroes,' ten of whom were selected by the Delphic oracle as Eponymoi for the Attic tribes. One of the eighty rejected is shown to have been 'Αραφῆν, after whom a *deme* was named, now Raphina.

3. Pp. 168-70. Six passages of Quintilian critically discussed by Max Bonnet.

4. Pp. 171-80. List of the variants of the Phaedo furnished by ancient quotations, collected by P. Couvreur.

5. Pp. 181-3. A fragment of Hesiod on a papyrus of the British Museum, published and discussed by F. G. Kenyon.

6. P. 184. Max Bonnet shows that the Greek name of the Tiber, *Θυμβρίς*, probably occurs in Latin as *Thymbris*. Traces are found in the MSS of Vergil and elsewhere.

7. Pp. 185-6. Note on the MSS of the *Silvae* of Statius, by Max Bonnet.

8. Pp. 187-9. Book Notices. (1). *Medien und das Haus des Kyaxares*, von J. V. Prásek. Described and commended by F. Chavannes. (2). *Raimund Oehler, Klassisches Bilderbuch*. Unfavorably mentioned by B. H. (3). D. A. H. Van Eck, *Quaestiones scenicae romanae*. Philippe Fabia describes this work, and finds that it contributes much to the solution of the difficult problems relating to the Roman theatre. It is, however, too diffuse.

The *Revue des Revues*, begun in a previous number, is completed with this number.

MILTON W. HUMPHREYS.

#### ROMANIA, Vol. XX (1891).

##### Janvier.

Th. Batiouchkof. *Le Débat du corps et de l'âme*. 55 pages (*à suivre*). "Il est bien rare qu'on puisse tout préciser dans l'histoire de la formation d'une légende: il reste presque toujours quelque chose d'insaisissable, et c'est précisément cet élément irréductible et mystérieux qui donne un charme particulier aux recherches de ce genre."

\* P. A. Guarnerio. *Postille sul lessico sardo*. A considerable number of Sardinian etymologies, the most interesting article being one in further illustration of Gaston Paris's derivation of French *andain* from Latin *indaginem* (Romania, XIX 452).

P. Meyer. *Le langage de Die au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*. The basis of this study is a 'censier' (rent-roll) of the bishopric of Die, recently published from the original manuscript, of which a facsimile page is here given. "En Dauphiné, la configuration physique du pays soulève de bien curieux problèmes qu'on ne peut résoudre avec les documents écrits. Par exemple, les caractères linguistiques se développent-ils dans le sens des vallées ou franchissent-ils les montagnes? Il y a là une étude intéressante à faire et qui pourrait avoir une portée historique autant que philologique."

G. Doncieux. *La Pernelle*: origine, histoire et restitution critique d'une chanson populaire romane. 50 pages. The 'complainte,' of seventeen lines, known as *La Pernelle* (name of the heroine) is not only one of the most beautiful, but also one of the most widely diffused of the French lyrico-epic songs that have been transmitted by popular tradition. Following the initiative of Gaston Paris in a similar task, M. Doncieux, by the aid of a truly surprising array of critical apparatus, proceeds to establish a definitive text of this little poem.

Mélanges. F. Lot. *Clovis en Terre Sainte*. Points out that Pio Rajna's inference, from a passage in Gregory of Tours, that an early legend had credited Clovis with a visit to the Holy Land, was due to a misinterpretation of the Latin author.—G. Paris. Robert le Clerc d'Arras, auteur des *Vers de la Mort*.—P. Meyer. *Les trois Maries*: cantique provençal du XV<sup>e</sup> siècle.

Contes-rendus. M. Kawczynski. *Essai comparatif sur l'origine et l'histoire des rythmes* (A. Vernier).<sup>1</sup> "Cet *Essai* est véritablement un recueil de thèses dont chacune forme un chapitre, et dans lesquelles on trouve une érudition nourrie, une argumentation serrée."—*Erec und Enide*, von Christian von Troyes, herausgegeben von Wendelin Foerster (G. Paris). A review of nineteen closely-printed pages, throwing light at once upon the minutest and the largest problems, of which this edition has so many, great and small, to offer. Concerning the burning question of the ultimate origin of the Round Table romances, Prof. Paris says: "Je réserve pour un autre lieu la discussion de ce qu'il faut entendre par 'breton' dans le français du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle. *Erec*, comme on l'a vu plus haut, peut être *directement* de provenance armoricaine."—*Provenzalische Inedita aus Pariser Handschriften*, herausgegeben von Carl Appel (P. Meyer). The editor proposes to publish all the inedited troubadour poetry contained in the 'chansonnières' of the Paris National Library. "Il n'y a que deux manières de concevoir la publication de la poésie des troubadours. On peut publier les chansonniers, un à un, tels qu'ils se présentent, sans introduire aucune correction dans le texte—rien n'empêche, bien entendu, de proposer toutes les corrections désirables dans les notes. On peut aussi faire l'édition critique d'un troubadour, à l'aide de tous les mss. Ce sont deux œuvres également utiles, qui répondent à des besoins différents."—*Les Livres de Comptes des frères Bonis, marchands montalbanais du XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle*, publiés

<sup>1</sup> See the elaborate review by F. M. WARREN, A. J. P. XI, 385-371.—B. L. G.

et annotés pour la Société historique de Gascogne, par Ed. Forestié (P. Meyer). "J'ai lu ce volume la plume à la main, j'y ai remarqué un grand nombre de faits intéressant l'histoire des mœurs, des usages, du droit au moyen âge; j'en ai tiré de nombreuses notes pouvant servir à la lexicographie ou à la grammaire."—Le grand et vrai art de pleine rhétorique de Pierre Fabri, publié avec introduction, notes et glossaire par A. Héron (E. Picot). The treatise here published anew first appeared in 1522, and had passed through six editions before the middle of the sixteenth century, yet ancient copies are now scarcely to be met with. Despite the faults of the work, sometimes even by reason of them, the book furnishes interesting and instructive information.

Chronique. Konrad Hofmann, professor of Romance philology at the University of Munich from 1869, died on September 30, 1890, in his seventy-first year. The 70th anniversary of his birth had been celebrated by the presentation of a collection of learned treatises prepared by former pupils, which was followed by the dedication to Professor Hofmann of Foerster's edition of *Erec und Enid*, noticed above.—Auguste Scheler, librarian to the King of the Belgians, died on the 16th of November, 1890, at the age of seventy-one. Apart from his official functions, he was chiefly known as the author of the *Dictionnaire d'étymologie française*, the third edition of which appeared in 1888, and as the competent editor and annotator of numerous Old French texts.—On the occasion of the 25th anniversary of his doctorat-ès-lettres (December 29, 1890), forty-five of the former pupils (of French-speaking countries) of Gaston Paris offered him a commemorative volume of studies, in the production of which twenty-eight of them had collaborated.

Livres annoncés sommairement. Thirty titles.

Avril.

P. Meyer. *Nouvelles catalanes inédites (suite)*. Continued from volume XIII (1884).

A. Dietrich. *Les parlers créoles des Mascareignes*. 50 pages. A comparative study of the closely related French Créole dialects of the islands of La Réunion and Mauritius.

Mélanges. F. Lot. *La croix des royaux de France*. According to a legend preserved in the *Real di Francia*, all the persons of French royal lineage bore as a birth-mark a cross upon the shoulder. M. Lot here controverts certain of Rajna's deductions concerning the history of this legend: "l'auteur a trop souvent confondu l'épopée et la légende."—P. Meyer. *Chanson à la Vierge en vers français et latins alternes*.—E. Langlois. *Adserum, innoctem, demane*. In the patois of the département de la Meuse, *hier (heri)* is replaced by *âçô (adserum)*, *aujourd'hui (hui = hodie)* by *anoi (innoctem)*; *demain (demane instead of cras)* is reproduced in *dmain*. The parallelism of *adserum* and *innoctem* with *demane* is adduced in support of the correctness of the first two etymologies, and the substitution in the case of all three words is referred to the ancient custom of the Celts (Caesar, *De Bello Gall.*, VI xviii) and the Germans (Tacitus, *De Mor. Germ.*, XI) to reckon time by nights rather than by days.—A. Salmon. *Tateron et teteron*.—Ch. Joret. *Bibeux*.—

A. Delboulle. Avoir des *crignons*, des *grésillons* ou des *grillons* dans la tête. Corrects the erroneous explanation of Godefroy's Dictionary.

Comptes-rendus. The Fables of Aesop as first printed by William Caxton in 1484, with those of Avian, Alfonso and Poggio, now again edited and induced by Joseph Jacobs. I. History of the Aesopic Fable (L. Sudre). "Le livre de M. J. a l'avantage de nous mettre au courant de ces innombrables travaux [sur l'histoire de la fable] et de nous présenter la matière au point où l'a amenée la science contemporaine. Il a en outre le mérite de nous la présenter avec clarté et même avec un charme tout particulier." The review is elaborate and instructive.—Libeaus Desconus, die mitttelenglische Romanze vom schönen Unbekannten, nach sechs Handschriften u. s. w. von Dr. Max Kaluza.—Der Bel Inconnu des Renaut de Beaujeu in seinem Verhältniss zum Lybeaus Desconus, Carduino und Wigalois. Eine literarhistorische Studie u. s. w. von Albert Mennung (G. Paris). "La source de toutes nos versions est un conte 'breton' issu de la fusion de trois épisodes, dont le seul essentiel est le 'fier baiser' (désenchantement, au moyen d'un baiser, d'une jeune fille transformée en serpent)."—Rondeaux et autres poésies du XVe siècle, publiés par Gaston Raynaud (A. Piaget). "Ce qui fait l'importance exceptionnelle de cette anthologie, c'est que de tous les morceaux qui la composent trois seulement sont anonymes." Forty versifiers share in the authorship of the collection.—N. Puitspelu. Dictionnaire étymologique du patois lyonnais (E. Philippon). Twelve pages of detailed criticism, to which P. Meyer adds two pages of observations.

Périodiques. The present number is especially rich in reports of periodicals, a number of long-standing arrears being brought up to date.

Chronique. Gustav Gröber having been chosen to occupy the place left vacant by Ebert on the 'comité directeur' of the Diez foundation, this committee is at present constituted as follows: Professors Tobler (President), Mommsen, Johannes Schmidt, G. Paris, Gröber, appointed by the Berlin Academy; Mussafia, appointed by the Academy of Vienna; and Ascoli, appointed by the Academy of the *Lincei*. The prize of this foundation, which is bestowed quadriennially, was awarded in 1884 to Pio Rajna, for his 'Origini dell' epopea francese'; in 1888 to Adolf Gaspary, for his 'Geschichte der italienischen Litteratur'; [and in 1892 to W. Meyer-Lübke, for his 'Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen'].—Mr. Birch-Hirschfeld, professor of Romance philology at Giessen, has been called to Leipsic as successor to the late Prof. Ebert.

Livres annoncés sommairement. Twenty-nine titles. The *Exempla* or Illustrative Stories from the *Sermones Vulgares* of Jacques de Vitry. Edited, with introduction, analysis and notes, by Thomas Frederick Crane. London, Nutt (publication of the English Folklore Society). "Il y a plus d'une critique à adresser tant au plan qu'à l'exécution de ce volume (voy. Rev. Crit. 1891, février); mais M. Crane, qui s'est trouvé pour son travail dans des conditions particulièrement défavorables, n'en mérite pas moins la reconnaissance de tous ceux qui s'occupent de littérature comparée et de mythographie pour cette publication, depuis longtemps souhaitée, et qui conservera longtemps une place des plus importantes dans ces études."

Juillet.

Pio Rajna. I più antichi periodi risolutamente volgari nel dominio italiano. A discussion of the two most ancient examples of legal declarations recorded in vernacular Italian, dating respectively from A. D. 960 and 964. They are the oldest known specimens of the Italian language, and read as follows: 1. Sao ko kelle terre per kelle fini que ki contene trenta anni le possette parte sancti benedicti; 2. Sao cco kelle terre per kelle fini que tebe mostrai trenta anni le possette parte Sancte Marie.

A. Longnon. Un fragment retrouvé du *Meliador* de Froissart. Froissart alludes twice in his writings to a work of his, otherwise unknown, entitled *Meliador*. Mr. Longnon has had the good fortune to discover a few hundred lines of this poem hidden in the parchment covers of some judicial documents belonging to the French national archives. These fragments are here published.

A. Piaget. La Cour amoureuse, dite de Charles VI. On St. Valentine's day, 1400, a number of 'grands seigneurs' and poets, with the design of honoring the fair sex and cultivating poetry, founded at the hôtel of the duc de Bourgogne at Paris a vast association, which they called the *Court amoureuse*. This society, so interesting from the double point of view of social and literary history, has hitherto received the scantiest possible attention from scholars. Mr. Piaget devotes to it 38 pages of charming history and criticism. "Tous étaient amoureux, partant tous rimaient."

Mélanges. P. Meyer. Poésie française à la Vierge copiée en Limousin.—P.-A. Geijer. *Cabaret*. Offers a doubtful etymology.—A. Thomas, Ad. Hatzfeld. Coquilles lexicographiques. "Depuis Robert Estienne, qui, par son Dictionnaire françois latin (1539), est le vrai père de la lexicographie française, jusqu'à Littré, que de 'coquilles' [misprints] échappées aux compilateurs ont fait leur chemin dans le monde et en imposent encore aujourd'hui." The editors of the new Dictionnaire général de la langue française, now in process of publication, trace the history of a number of such *coquilles*, consecrated by traditional miscopying, or rather misapplied accuracy of copying, on the part of successive dictionary-makers.

Comptes-rendus. Max Bonnet. Le latin de Grégoire de Tours (A. Vernier). The reviewer discusses chiefly Bonnet's view of the relations subsisting between literary Latin and folk-Latin. "Peut-être devra-t-on convenir avec M. B. que certains romanistes, désireux de faire mieux sentir une distinction qu'ils jugeaient utile, sont allés un peu trop loin. . . . Les romanistes à mon avis n'ont nullement tort de dire que le roman ne sort pas, au moins directement, du latin classique. Je vais tâcher de donner les motifs de cette opinion."—Ernst Voigt. Egberts von Lüttich *Fecunda Ratis* (L. Sudre). "C'est là, en effet, un bien curieux ouvrage, qui nous ouvre des horizons nouveaux sur la pédagogie médiévale et sur la vie des proverbes et des fables dans la première partie du XI<sup>e</sup> siècle."—M. Friedwagner. Ueber die Sprache des altfranzösischen Heldengedichtes Huon de Bordeaux; M. Schweigel. Esclarmonde, Clarisse et Florent, Yde et Olive: drei Fortsetzungen der Chanson von Huon de Bordeaux (M. Wilmotte). "M. Friedwagner a essayé de résoudre certains

problèmes que soulevait l'examen des formes de *Huon*, et s'il n'y réussit pas toujours . . . il a le mérite de ne pas être un simple statisticien." Apropos of Mr. Schweigel's dissertation, the reviewer remarks: "La vérité est que l'époque tardive à laquelle nous reportent ces suites insignifiantes de *Huon* n'autorise plus une détermination précise de leur dialecte."—P. de Mugica. Gramática del castellaño antiguo (A. Morel-Fatio). "Il faut louer l'intention de M. de Mugica, mais on ne peut guère louer que cela dans son livre."—J. T. Buroda. Cercetări despre școlălele românești din Turcia [Investigations concerning the Roumanian schools in Turkey] (E. Picot). "Dès aujourd'hui 2000 enfants macédo-roumains échappent à l'influence grecque et tournent les yeux vers Bucarest comme vers leur vraie capitale."

Périodiques.

Chronique. In a printed letter, dated Göttingen, June, 1891, Dr. Karl Vollmöller informs his colleagues and friends that he has resigned his professorship of Romance philology at the University of Göttingen, in order to devote himself henceforth to scientific studies.—The Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres has this year awarded the prize founded by M. le marquis de La Grange to M. Héron, for his edition of Pierre Fabri (see above) and for his collective publications relating to the poetry of the middle ages. In the 'concours des Antiquités Nationales,' the same Academy has awarded the third medal to M. Jeanroy for his 'Origines de la poésie lyrique,' and the fifth mention to Nizier de Puitspelu for his 'Dictionnaire du patois lyonnais' (see above).

Livres annoncés sommairement. Ten titles. Vowel Measurements, by Charles H. Grandgent, Director of Modern Languages in the High and Latin Schools, Boston, Mass. (Publications of the Modern Language Association.) "L'auteur expose, avec planches à l'appui, les procédés ingénieux dont il s'est servi afin de mesurer les mouvements des organes mis en jeu pour l'articulation des voyelles. Il a très sagement borné ses observations à son propre parler; mais sa méthode est naturellement applicable à d'autres langues que l'anglais de Boston."

Octobre.

Th. Batiouchkof. Le Débat de l'âme et du corps. II. Les versions originaires de la légende du corps et de l'âme. 66 pages. The author treats the second portion of his subject under the following heads: A. La légende sous forme de vision; B. La tenson provençale 'de l'arma e del cors,' le poème italien de Bonvesin da Riva, la version tchèque 'Spor duše s tělem' et le poème arménien 'Les vers de l'âme'; C. L'origine probable des deux groupes de légendes signalés; D. Les traditions sur le conflit de l'âme et du corps pendant la vie de l'homme. In an appendix is printed the Latin text of the legend attributed to Macaire d'Alexandrie as given in the MS at Rome.

P. Meyer. Nouvelles catalanes inédites (fin): IV. Le harnois du chevalier, poème allégorique de Peire March; V. Histoire de Frondino et de Brisona; VI. Petit traité des fêtes mobiles. 36 pages.

Mélanges. Ad. Hatzfeld, Ant. Thomas. Coquilles lexicographiques. A further instalment of the article above noted.

Périodiques.

Chronique. Professor Gaspary leaves the chair of Romance philology at Breslau to succeed Vollmöller at Göttingen.

Livres annoncés sommairement. Thirty-one titles.

H. A. TODD.

---

BEITRÄGE ZUR ASSYRIOLOGIE UND VERGLEICHENDEN SEMITISCHEN SPRACHWISSENSCHAFT, herausgegeben von FRIEDRICH DELITZSCH und PAUL HAUPT. II. Band, Heft 3 (pp. 557-645). Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1893.

The third and last number of the second volume of the *Beiträge* is entirely Assyriological.

Dr. Bruno Meissner publishes, with translation, commentary and text (pp. 557-64), four ancient Babylonian letters dating from the time of the first Babylonian dynasty (2399-2094 B. C.). Communications of this sort usually refer to the business transactions of temples and of bankers, and consequently throw hardly any light on the private life of the period. Meissner explains that they differ externally from the ancient Babylonian contract tablets simply in not being enclosed in an outer case. They were generally written quickly and intended for rapid transmission, and consequently contained little of sufficient importance to be preserved in records. They are of value to the modern world, however, because of the glimpses they give of the early Babylonian civilization and because they frequently contain linguistic matter of great interest to the grammarian and lexicographer. Meissner's interpretation of *mašša* and *šilla* (p. 561) as denoting some skin-like covering is probably correct. He might have added to his references for *šilla* the passage II R. 44, 38<sub>r</sub>, where, although the text is somewhat mutilated, the word certainly occurs. Meissner does not appear to have noticed that *šilla* is probably used in II R. 35, 72<sub>g</sub>h to denote some part of the female sexual organ, possibly the hymen. The passage reads: *ardatu ša etlu damqu šillāša lā iptāru* 'a girl whose virginity no kindly husband has as yet destroyed.' This passage forms a perfect parallelism with the lines just preceding it (ll. 68-71), where *šubātu*, ordinarily 'a garment,' is apparently used as a synonym of *šilla* in this sense. In ZA. I 56 Jensen regarded *šilla* as a cognate of שִׁילָה 'the twig or thorn of the date-palm' (?).

Dr. Meissner has also contributed a treatise on two Assyrian decrees of exemption, e. g. royal declarations making certain districts or countries free from taxation (pp. 564-72). The chief importance of these documents lies in the fact that they are Assyrian, as such decrees have hitherto been found only in the Babylonian. Meissner states that these newly found Assyrian inscriptions differ chiefly from the Babylonian documents in being written entirely on clay. Besides this, the Assyrian decrees, unlike those of Babylonia, contain no pictorial representations except the royal seal. The expression *ina*

*šumi damqi irbā* (p. 566, l. 19b; 569) simply means 'they grew up in a happy state.' *Šumu* 'name' can also mean 'existence' or 'condition,' and then 'posterity.' This latter meaning is seen in a number of proper names (cf. Lehmann, *Šamašsumukin*, pt. I, p. 11).

Dr. C. F. Lehmann, in his rather lengthy article on a seal cylinder of Bur-Sin, king of Isin, which is at present in the Berlin Museum, has discussed exhaustively, in the light of certain data obtained by the last American expedition to Babylonia, the name and personality of this ancient Babylonian king (pp. 589-621). Lehmann's idea that the name Bur-Sin might be read Uzun-Sin ('ear or understanding of the Moon-god,' p. 599) does not seem at all probable. He himself was forced to admit (p. 607) that his long discussion of this subject is practically without result. Delitzsch has shown satisfactorily, in his short article on Babylonian proper names (pp. 622-6), that such expressions as 'eye or ear of the Moon-god' cannot be established, and that consequently Lehmann's deduction from epithets of this sort that the Babylonian kings were regarded as standing in the closest relationship with the deity requires additional proof.

The feature of Dr. Lehmann's article which is perhaps the most interesting for those not initiated in all the technicalities of Assyriology is the writer's explanation of the well-known geographical terms Sumer and Akkad, and of the frequently occurring title 'king of the four regions.' According to Lehmann, the name Sumer (Sumerian *kingi* 'land,' II R. 39, 9, etc.) is used to denote the southernmost part of Babylonia, where the Tigris and Euphrates come together, e. g. the region about the ancient city of Ur. *Akkadā*, on the other hand, is the country about and between the two rivers, or the real Mesopotamia, in the northern part of which the streams approach each other nearest. The writer maintains that this use of the two names can be traced through the entire Assyro-Babylonian literature. The title 'king of the four regions,' however, cannot be defined so exactly, but seems to imply, as Tiele suggested, a widely-extended sovereignty or sovereign right (*Geschichte*, p. 73). Lehmann has shown that this title was borne by purely Semitic rulers in northern Babylonia, and in the present article he explains, by means of certain recently-discovered inscriptions, the development by the early Semitic northern Babylonian kings of a supremacy over the entire surrounding country. Winckler (*Untersuchungen*, p. 74) held the view that the name 'Sumer and Akkad' denoted southern Babylonia, while Akkad alone was used as a term for all Babylonia. He considered that the 'kingdom of the four regions' was a state distinct from Babylonia proper (l. c., p. 71). A full discussion of this subject was published by Lehmann in his *Šamašsumukin* (pt. I, pp. 86 ff.).

The second volume of the *Beiträge* closes with S. Arthur Strong's publication of some oracles to Esarhaddon and Ašurbanipal (pp. 626-45). Communications of this sort, usually addressed to kings, are among the most interesting portions of the Assyro-Babylonian literature, as it is possible to obtain from them some knowledge of the exact relations existing between the king and the priests of the different cults. Thus, in the first specimen published by Mr. Strong, the king is encouraged by a prophecy of his coming triumph over all his enemies. The object of the last oracle, however, where the goddess

Ištar is supposed to be speaking, seems to be rather to impress on the royal mind the necessity of a proper observance of the obligations due to her sanctuary—a probable indication that there had been some neglect of the offerings. The expression *sarsarāni* (p. 628, l. 10; p. 631) is probably not for *šaršarāni*, but, according to Strong's other suggestion, may be a derivative of *סרר*. The word is evidently a reduplicated form of *sarru* 'rebellious' (II R. 49, 35<sup>ef</sup>; 51, 69<sup>ab</sup> (cf. also *sartu* 'sīn,' ASKT. 127, 55, IV R. 51, 34<sup>a</sup>, and the well-known *surratu* 'rebellion'). *Sarāru*, which seems to mean 'protection' (BAI. 225, 27), is a derivative in a good sense from this same stem, the original meaning of which was 'press together, be firm.' On p. 628 the expression *annā šulmu ša ina pān ṣalme* (p. 628, l. 26) seems to mean simply 'this (referring to the benefits just described) is the blessing which is in the presence of the image,' e. g. the image of the shrine where the oracle was given. It does not seem necessary to understand here, with Strong, a god *Ṣalmu*, because, if this were the name of a divinity, as in the passages cited by the author, it seems reasonable to expect that the usual determinative for a deity would have been placed before the noun, in order to prevent any ambiguity with the ordinary *ṣalmu* 'image.'

J. DYNELEY PRINCE.

## BRIEF MENTION.

The *Eighth Book of Thukydides*, hitherto the least favored of the family, seems to be destined to more abundant honor. Scarcely has one welcomed Mr. Tucker's edition when Mr. GOODHART's comes to the front and challenges attention (Macmillan & Co.). One is glad to see that Mr. Goodhart has taken his courage in both hands and, like Mr. Tucker, ventures to oppose the redoubtable Dr. Rutherford in his onslaught on the text of Thukydides. Continental critics and, one may add, American critics have never stood much in awe of Dr. Rutherford, but his swashbuckler ways at one time frightened some of the younger generation of English scholars out of their propriety, although it is tolerably evident now that Dr. Rutherford's brilliancy and dash are out of all proportion to his judgment. But while Mr. Goodhart is to be congratulated on his independence and his resolution, his work does not commend itself irresistibly. In his criticism there is a good deal of the *nodum in scirpo quaerere*, which so many people mistake for a short cut to a reputation for acuteness, and from his discussion of the 'verbal points' in Thukydides, for which he half-way apologizes in the Preface, there is very little to gain. The inductions made from von Essen's Index need illumination from a wider knowledge of the language, and some of the grammatical notes are trivial and for the advanced student, who alone is likely to meddle with the eighth book of Thukydides, utterly unnecessary. On Chapter IV, however, there is one long note that is welcome, but welcome only because it serves to point a moral. If a Greek sentence gives up its sense readily when read aloud, there is no need of a long discourse about its articulation, and so here a simple reading aloud of Chapter IV, with the right inflexion of the voice, makes the whole sentence—there is but one—perfectly transparent. It is a problem of parenthesis such as a student of Browning would make very light of.

παρεσκευάζοντο δὲ καὶ  
Ἀθηναῖοι,

τὴν τε ναυπηγίαν  
καὶ Σούνιον

καὶ τό τε ἐν τῇ Λακωνικῇ  
τειχισμα

καὶ τὰλλα

μάλιστα δὲ τὰ τῶν ξυμμάχων

ὥσπερ διανοήθησαν ἐν τῇ  
αὐτῷ χειμῶνι τούτῳ,  
ξύλα ξυμπορισάμενοι  
τειχίσαντες, ὅπως αὐτοῖς  
ἀσφάλεια ταῖς σιταγωγαῖς νανσὶν  
εἴη τοῦ περίπλου,

ἐκλιπόντες δ' ἐνφοδόμησαν  
παραπλέοντες ἐς Σικελίαν,  
εἰ ποῦ τι ἐδόκει ἀχρεῖον  
ἀναλίσκεσθαι, ξυστελλόμενοι  
ἐς εὐτέλειαν,  
διασκοποῦντες ὅπως  
μὴ σφῶν ἀποστήσονται.

But as I write, the *Τοργεῖη κεφαλὴ* of Dr. Rutherford's Fourth Book rises before me, the whole of the second column vanishes into the margin, and nothing is left but the petrified backbone of the sentence.

Perhaps I may be allowed to illustrate by a single specimen what is to me the irritating element in Mr. Goodhart's grammatical observations. On *τὰ περὶ τῆς πολιορκίας* (c. 14, 2) he remarks: 'In such phrases Thuc. appears to use gen. and acc. indifferently. For the gen. cf. VI 32, 3; VIII 26, 2. For the acc. I 13, 2; VIII 11, 3.' Now, the regular periphrasis is *τὰ περὶ* c. acc., according to the rule after verbs of happening. And the rare change to *τὰ περὶ* c. gen. is due almost invariably in classical times to the influence of some verb of saying or thinking in the neighborhood. To be sure, this is an old story, going back at least as far as Heindorf on Plato, *Phaedo* 57 B, but as some unwary novice may think that Mr. Goodhart has brushed away Heindorf, Krüger, Kühner, Breitenbach and the rest, it may be worth while to look into the examples adduced. VI 32, 3 *τὰ περὶ* is preceded by *ἡγγέλλετο*; VIII 26, 2 by *εἰδέναι* and the gen. is not surprising. In I 13, 2 *μεταχειρίσαι* naturally takes *περὶ* c. acc., and in VIII 11, 3 *ἡγγέλθη* follows, and is not thought of until too late. In the passage under immediate consideration, VIII 14, 2, *γενομένων λόγων* precedes and *οὐ δηλωσάντων* follows, thus creating a complete atmosphere of *περὶ* c. gen. The Thukydeidean examples of *τὰ περὶ* c. gen. have been collected by Debbert in his dissertation '*de praepositionum περὶ et ἀμφὶ usu Thucydideo*', pp. 11, 12, and they are all to be explained in the same way—that is, by the neighborhood of a verb that regularly takes *περὶ* c. gen. So, in addition to the passages given above, II 42, 1: *ἐμήκονα*; VII 75, 4: *δεδιότας*; and in the book of Mr. Goodhart's predilection, 26, 3: *πυνθάνονται*; 33, 4: *ἀναζητήσαντες*; 54, 1: *ἀκούων χαλεπῶς ἔφερε*; 63, 1: *πυθόμενος*. Turning to another sphere we find the same principle true in the orators, who very seldom use *τὰ περὶ* c. gen., but when they do, yield only to the temptation of a verb or other word that takes *περὶ* c. gen. Lutz (*Die Praepositionen bei den attischen Rednern*, p. 133) cites Lys. 4, 1 (*ἀρνεῖσθαι*); Isokr. 12, 232 (*ἐλυπήθην καὶ βαρέως ἔφερον*) (cf. §§131, 132: *δυσχεραίνειν περὶ* c. gen.); Dem. 57, 67 (*πῶς ἂν ἐπιδείξαιμι*); 68 (*ἀκούσατε*); Isok. 15, 59 (*ἀνάγνωθι*); Ep. II 14 (*παραλείπτεον*); Dem. 4, 36 (*ἀόριστα*). Most interesting of all is Dem. 27, 30, because it seems to violate the rule, and for that reason I give it in full: *καὶ μὲν, ὧ ἄνδρες δικασταί, καὶ τὰ περὶ τοῦ ἐλέφαντος καὶ σιδήρου τοῦ καταλειφθέντος παραπλήσιά πως πεποιήκασιν. But πεποιήκασιν here carries with it the notion of a *περὶ* c. gen. verb, as is shown by the next sentence: οὐδὲ γὰρ ταῦτ' ἀποφαίνουσιν. Herodotos, Xenophon and Plato seem to be fairly steady, though Lina in his dissertation *de praepositionum usu Platónico* tries to show for Plato that in the later dialogues his usage approaches that of Polybios. But a mere counting of *περὶ* c. acc. and *περὶ* c. gen. will not suffice. That Polybios is not clear in his mind need not surprise us. See the examples in Krebs, *Die Praepositionen bei Polybios*, S. 105. Krebs (S. 99) saves some of the examples on the principle already given, but the consciousness has evidently broken down wholly, as it had broken down here and there in the best times. But for Thukydidēs Goodhart's examples prove nothing whatever.*

Professor BURTON's book on the *Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek* (Chicago, University Press of Chicago) withdraws itself from the serious consideration of syntacticians both by its plan and by its execution. It has to do professedly with exegetical and not with historical syntax, as if exegetical syntax did not demand historical syntax, not only incidentally but fundamentally. In fact, one great trouble about N. T. syntax has been the failure to appreciate the historical relations of N. T. Greek. In any other sphere such a hotchpotch as Winer's Grammar would have been a stale anachronism years ago, and perhaps even 'telic' and 'ecbatic' would have ceased from troubling. True, by keeping close under cover of the authorities on classical Greek syntax, Professor Burton has to a certain extent evaded responsibility, though he cannot be congratulated everywhere on his choice of a leader. So, for instance, his departure from the ordinary treatment of the participle is hardly to be considered an improvement. And yet, despite his care to shelter himself behind the shield of this syntactical Ajax and that, he has exposed himself at a number of points, and such blunders as *ὅς λάβη ἄν*, *ὅς οὐδὲν ἄν* (§150) and *συμφέρει οὐ γαμήσαι* (§264) are without defence. It is bad method to make the chief example for the gnomic aorist (§43) (1 Pet. 1, 24) a quotation from the Septuagint; it is contrary to the author's own principles given forth in the preface to bring into bold relief the unreal relative (§302), a construction that is very rare in standard Greek and, according to Professor Burton himself, non-existent in the N. T. After all that has been written about *ὥστε*, it seems strange to have *ὥστε* with inf. considered as an intrusion on the sphere of *ὥστε* with ind. (§235) (cf. A. J. P. VII 171, XIV 241); nor is it much less strange to find an article which was written to show that *ὅπως* with subj. and *ὅπως ἄν* with subj. are not equivalent, cited to prove their indifference (§195). Under the aor. part. of subsequent action (§142) there are two examples—one an articular participle, which does not count, as it is a mere parenthetical identification, and the other is Acts 25, 13, where it is a superstition to retain *ἀσπασόμενοι*. 'Some primitive error,' say Westcott and Hort, 'is not impossible.' The long note (§343) to justify the 'supposition' that interrogative opt. with *ἄν* in dependent discourse is an original opt. with *ἄν* is a waste of printer's ink on an elementary matter. These are a few of the points that a cursory examination reveals, enough perhaps to show that Greek of every sphere must be studied in the light of the history of the language from the beginning.

But these jottings on Professor Burton's book would have been pigeonholed with a host of other annotations on current manuals, if his remarks on the imperative future had not reminded me of a little article which I had written some time ago *à propos* of Rosenberg's new edition of Westermann's *Demosthenes* (Berlin, Weidmann, 1890). It is too long for *Brief Mention*, it is too short for a separate article, it is too late for a review. But the subject it may be worth while to give, as it deals with an inveterate superstition. In §67 R. we are told by Professor Burton that the negative of the prohibitory future in the N. T. is not *μή*, 'as commonly in classical Greek, but *οὐ*.' Then follow the authorities. Now, when one reflects that this precious rule about *μή* with fut. ind. as an imperative rests on just two passages of Attic prose—Lys. XXIX 13 and Dem. XXIII 117—both open to suspicion, both suggestive of

emendation, one cannot suppress one's astonishment at such an aberration as Aken's 'häufig auch μή' (Tempus u. Modus, §44), and at such an expenditure of metaphysics as Rosenberg has thought fit (l. c.) to cite from the Classical Review (II, p. 323). But though I have almost taken a vow to be silent on the subject of the Greek negative, I may be forced to return to the pestilent theme before long.

All that Professor JEBB had to fear in undertaking the course of lectures which he delivered in the spring of 1892 on the Percy Turnbull Memorial Foundation was the unavoidable comparison with himself. But from that comparison with himself he has come forth with his wonted triumphant adequacy, and his lectures on the *Growth and Influence of Classical Greek Poetry* (Boston, Houghton, Mifflin & Co.) exemplify all that he has to say about 'Hellenic clearness of outline,' 'Hellenic obedience to the sense of measure and harmony.' He has said the best things in the best way; and while the best things are inevitable and must be said over again, unless one is content to fall into mere paradox, still those who know the ground traversed by Professor Jebb will welcome new angles of vision and new touches of color which are gained by his guidance. His style is limpid, but does not lack strength. His rare figures illuminate his theme and do not interpose a screen of impertinent imagery between the student and the study. Especially admirable is the way in which he has solved the difficult problem of such a poet as Pindar. Instead of rising to Pindaric or pseudo-Pindaric heights in the characteristic of the Songs of Victory, he leads the reader up to the point at which he can enjoy the poet himself, and then makes way for a felicitous rendering of Pindar's splendid diction, and Pindar is made responsible for his own intoxication. As is well known, not only is Professor Jebb a close student of Pindar, but he has himself handled Pindaric forms with unequalled mastery; and yet he is no stranger to the charm of Simonidean simplicity—and an epigram which breathes Simonidean simplicity<sup>1</sup> opens the volume. Still,

<sup>1</sup> *In Memoriam.*

PERCY GRAEME TURNBULL,

NATUS EST MAHI DIE VICESIMO OCTAVO A. D. MDCCCLXXXVIII,  
OBIIT FEBRUARII DUODEVICESIMO A. D. MDCCCLXXXVII.

οἷα πρὶν ἀνθῆσαι ῥόδον ὄλλυται, ἐξεμαράνθης,  
εἶαρος οὐδ' ἐνάτου βηλὸν ἀμειψάμενος·  
σοῦ δὲ χάριν Μούσαις, ὅσας τις φάος ἔρχεται ἥρος  
δῶρα παρ' εὐσεβέων προσφέρεται γονέων.

The following translation has been sent to *Brief Mention*:

Like as a rose that ere it flow'r is lost  
So didst thou fade away,  
The threshold of thy ninth spring not yet crossed;  
Eut for thy sake do they,  
Thy loving parents, to the Muses bring,  
As often as returns the light of spring,  
A pious offering.

Simonides himself is not so near his heart as is Pindar, and one feels a slight jar when Simonides is called 'a clever and versatile man of the world, with all the subtle and graceful Ionic gifts, but without much depth of conviction and feeling.' To those who do not know poets in the flesh it is hardly conceivable that such a person should have been a master of pathos, but Professor Jebb's wide experience of literary life has doubtless taught him thus to distinguish between the poet and the man. If, according to Sainte-Beuve's famous sentence, the man survives the poet in three-fourths of us, the poet assuredly survives the man in many of the elect. At all events, the scholar does.

---

By the publication of his *Monumenta Linguae Ibericae* (Berlin, Georg Reimer, 1893) the eminent epigraphist, Professor HÜBNER, has completed his great work on Spanish Inscriptions. The first half of the book contains the *Prolegomena*, the second the coins and inscriptions. In the first two chapters of the *Prolegomena* a full and interesting account is given of the labors of numismatists and epigraphists in this tangled field of research. The third is devoted to the discussion of the alphabet, which is derived not from the Greek, but from the Phoenician; the fourth to the language, which is shown to have prevailed over the whole peninsula and the adjacent parts of Gaul, inhabited by an Iberian population. This Iberian language continued unmixed with the language of the Kelts, with which it has no affinity either in formation or inflexion. It is, in fact, the lonely parent of the lonely Basque of to-day, and Professor Hübner closes his introduction by commending the further investigation of the problem in these words: *Umbrae, quam depinximus, vitam fortasse inspirabunt qui Humboldtio duce linguae Vasconum hodiernae formam, quatenus recuperari potest, vetustissimam comparare suscipient cum reliquiis a nobis collectis lectis explicatis.*

## CORRESPONDENCE.

*To the Editor of THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY:*

*Sir:*—Among the newly acquired treasures of the Bodleian Library, next in importance to the now justly 'celebrated' manuscript Jamaspji 2, the appearance of which, in its collotyped edition, has made so deep an impression, must be named Jamaspji 3. This is a Yasna Zend-Sanskrit codex of smaller surface, but not on that account of any diminished value. Indeed, if its translation were in the more original Pahlavi, of which all the Sanskrit versions are translations, and if it were dated, it might turn out to be superior in its importance even to our great Jamaspji 2, which is undoubtedly older than its venerable twin-sister K5 (fifth in the University Library of Copenhagen), for its date (that of Jamaspji 3) might turn out to be some 70 years earlier than that of Jamaspji 2.

But first as to what it is. It measures about 8 inches  $\times$  5, with its written surface about 6 inches  $\times$  3. Its folios are numbered, and there were originally 260 of them. It begins with a short passage in Pahlavi from Vendidad xviii, from a later hand; and after considerable lacunae of lost matter, it ends with the 56th chapter at the fifth verse; but the last page of the original handwriting is 520, and that ends with Yasna 54, 1. Beyond this the handwriting entirely changes, becoming excessively careless to the close. But the original handwriting is the most beautiful which has been preserved in any of the more ancient codices. It seems, however, to be the work of more than one penman, and this even in its main bulk, and aside from the opening, which is often later in MSS, and its close, which was certainly added. As is the case with other old Zend documents, ink of two colors was used, black and red, the latter only sparingly (the occasionally red letters in Jamaspji 2 constituted the only feature that could not be conveniently reproduced in the collotype). The MS came into possession of the Bodleian in the following manner: As I had completed my volume of the Sacred Books of the East (XXXI), I took up again my unfinished work on the Gāthas, the completion of which had been interrupted by the written request of Professors Darmesteter and Max Müller that I should undertake the S. B. E. But wishing to make the Gātha study as complete as possible, and owing to a subvention from the Indian Office, I asked Destoor Jamaspji Minocheherji to loan me this most ancient of all Zend-Sanskrit Yasnas. I was as much surprised as gratified to receive an answer in the affirmative, for I had felt some compunctions at my request, Professor Roth having previously reported the MS as in a very fragile condition. It arrived in Oxford in 1888, and its condition was remarkable; while every letter could be read as easily as on the day when it was written. The paper of many folios was of a deep chocolate hue, and so brittle that the leaves could not be turned without risk, and several precious

folios had actually perished in transit and were a mass of *débris* so broken as to be past restoration. I at once placed every folio that was fragile between plates of glass, arranged as they have since remained: from this position they have been photographed successfully. I then at once communicated with the Destoor Jamaspji, reporting the condition of the precious document, and urging the great propriety of depositing it in the Bodleian Library, as the returning voyage to India would doubtless have been accompanied with fresh injuries to this heirloom of Zoroastrian science. The Destoor, while mentioning that he had hoped to place the codex nearer home, cordially presented it to the Vice-Chancellor to be deposited in the Bodleian Library, making only the request (with characteristic modesty) that he might be furnished with a photographic copy; and this request may well be regarded by the Curators as equivalent to a condition. This was in 1890, and the letter bears date April 25th. As estimated, this MS is not only the oldest of all the Zend-Sanskrit Yasnas, but it has just escaped being a memento of the highly gifted and most distinguished Neryosangh, to whom we owe so much Sanskrit translation of Parsi documents. Its colophon, if it ever possessed one, which is probable, has long since crumbled away; but a constant opinion exists among Parsees, to the effect that it was completed soon after Neryosangh's death. In default of other sources of information, this tradition must not be too hastily rejected. If the codex was written soon after the death of Neryosangh Dhaval, it must date from about 1250, for several prominent Parsee families trace their descent to that useful scholar; and from their genealogies we can form a closely approximating opinion as to when Neryosangh's death took place, for he must have been born about A. D. 1160. As to how far the possession of these unique documents is appreciated by the University of Oxford, the scientific world has now had ample proof, for the appropriation of money, generous though it has been, is not the sole evidence of interest which has been given. The execution of the collotype of Jamaspji 2 is little less than a work of fine art, and shows how complete the apparatus for such undertakings must be at the Clarendon Press. Let us hope that Jamaspji 3 will be given to the world in the same distinguished manner in which Jamaspji 2 was offered.

OXFORD, Jan. 1, 1894.

L. H. MILLS.

#### THE GREEK SYLLOGOS OF CANDIA.

To the Editor of THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY:

Sir:—The great inscription of Gortyna, the most famous of the epigraphical remains of Greek antiquity which have come down to us, is still left abandoned in the place where it was found in 1884. It is exposed, not only to the stress of weather and to the destructive action of the water of a canal which passes over it, but even to the more serious danger of being destroyed forever by an ignorant or malicious hand.

To save this inscription, to transport it and to preserve it in a safe place and one which is accessible, we invite the aid of all who know the great importance of this ancient relic.

To buy and transport the inscription will require a sum of about 10,000 francs. As it is not possible for our society to collect the entire amount in this island, we have decided to ask the aid of museums, universities, academies, institutes of archaeology, and of other scientific bodies, offering to them, on our part, a token of recognition for the aid they shall afford.

We shall have come to Crete a capable workman, to reproduce, in cast, the great inscription, and shall send to each society which will contribute £25 sterling a cast of the entire wall which contains the inscription, to be delivered free of expense at one of these four ports: Brindisi, Trieste, Genoa, Marseilles.

Hoping to meet on every side with sympathy and aid in this work, we await with the sincerest gratitude a favorable answer, so that we may begin without delay the labor.

*The President of the Syllogos*, Dr. JOSEPH HAZZIDAKIS,  
(Consular Agent of U. S. A. in Crete.)

*The Secretary*, Prof. S. XANTHOUDIDIS.

CANDIA, December 24, 1893.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. B. Westermann & Co., New York, for material furnished.

### AMERICAN.

Ball (C. J.) *An Elementary Hebrew Grammar*; with introd. by R. F. Weidner. New York and Chicago, *Fleming H. Revell Co.*, 1893. 423 pp. 8vo, cl., \$2.25.

Butcher (S. H.) *Some Aspects of the Greek Genius*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1893 [1894]. 321 pp. 12mo, cl., \$2.50.

Clark (J.) *Manual of Linguistics*. New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1893. 69 + 318 pp. 12mo, cl., \$2.

Guerber (H. A.) *Myths of Greece and Rome Narrated*; with special reference to literature and art. New York, *American Book Co.*, 1893. 2 + 428 pp. il., 12mo, cl., \$1.50.

Hyperides. *The Orations against Athenogenes and Philippides*; ed. with a tr. by F. G. Kenyon. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1893. 81 pp. 12mo, cl., \$1.60.

Muss-Arnolt (W.) *The Names of the Assyro-Babylonian Months and their Regents*. New York, *B. Westermann & Co.*, 1893. 40 pp. 8vo, pap., 40 cts.

— *On Semitic Words in Greek and Latin*. New York, *B. Westermann & Co.*, 1893. 156 pp. 8vo, pap., \$1.

Plato. *Protagoras*; with introd., notes and appendices by J. Adam. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1893. 213 pp. (Pitt Press Series.) 16mo, cl., \$1.25.

Plautus (T. M.) *Epidicus*; from the text of G. Goetz; with introd. and notes by J. H. Gray. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1893. 93 pp. 16mo, cl., 80 cts.

— *Stichus*; ed. with introd. and notes by C. A. M. Fennell. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1893. 55 pp. 16mo, cl., 60 cts.

Scartazzini (G. A.) *A Companion to Dante*; from the German, by Arthur J. Butler. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1893. 503 pp. 12mo, cl., \$3.

Smith (Goldwin). *Specimens of Greek Tragedy*. 2 v. V. 1. *Aeschylus and Sophocles*. V. 2. *Euripides*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1893. 16mo, buckram, ea. \$1.25.

Sophocles. *The Tragedies of Sophocles*; tr. into English prose from the text of Jebb by E. P. Coleridge. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1893. 437 pp. (Bohn's Classical Library.) 12mo, cl., \$1.50.

Velleius Paterculus (Caius). *Velleius Paterculus*, book 2, chapters 40-131 [Latin]; ed. with introd. and notes by F. E. Rockwood. Boston,

*Leach, Shewell & Sanborn*, 1893. c. 21 + 170 pp. (Student's Series of Latin Classics.) sq. 16mo, cl., \$1.

Vergil. The Eighth Book of Vergil's Aeneid; ed. for the use of schools by J. Tetlow. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1893. c. 11 + 191 pp. (School Classics.) 16mo, cl., 50 cts.

Xenophon. Tales from Cyropaedia; with vocabulary, notes and exercises by C. Haines Keene. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1893. 115 pp. 18mo, cl., 40 cts.

#### ENGLISH.

Catullus, with the Pervigilium Veneris. Ed. by S. G. Owen. Illust. by J. R. Weguelin. 8vo, 206 pp. *Lawrence & Bullen*. 16s.

Cicero. Actionis in C. Verrem Secundae Liber V: De Suppliciis. Ed. by W. C. Laming. Cr. 8vo. *Rivington, Percival & Co.* 3s. 6d.

Coleridge (Edward P.) The Tragedies of Sophocles. Tr. into English prose from the text of Jebb. Cr. 8vo, xxi + 437 pp. *G. Bell & Sons*. 5s.

Corpus Poetarum Latinum. New and revised ed. Ed. by J. P. Postgate. 4 parts. Part 1. 4to, sd. *G. Bell & Sons*. 9s.

Cowie (A.) English-Sulu-Malay Vocabulary. With useful sentences, etc. Ed. by W. C. Cowie. 8vo. *May*. 21s.

Demosthenes against Androtion and against Timocrates. With introd. and English notes by William Waite. 2d ed. Cr. 8vo, 300 pp. *Cambridge Warehouse*. 7s. 6d.

Dionysius the Areopagite: Celestial and Ecclesiastical Hierarchy. Now first translated into English from the original Greek by the Rev. John Parker. 8vo, 100 pp. *Skeffington*. 2s. 6d.

Easton (M. G.) Illustrated Bible Dictionary. Cr. 8vo, xi + 724 pp. *Nelsons*. 5s.

Erman (A.) Egyptian Grammar; with tables of signs, bibliography, etc. Tr. by J. H. Breasted. Cr. 8vo, 280 pp. *Williams & Norgate*. 18s.

Euripides. Bacchae. Introd., texts and notes. Ed. by A. H. Cruikshank. 12mo, 164 pp. *Clarendon Press*. 3s. 6d.

Green (A. O.) A Practical Arabic Grammar. Part 2. 3d ed., enlarged and revised. Cr. 8vo, 290 pp. *Clarendon Press*. 10s. 6d.

Horace. Odes and Epodes. Tr. by Earl Lytton. (Lubbock's One Hundred Books.) Cr. 8vo, 230 pp. *Routledge*. 2s.

New English Dictionary on Historical Principles. Ed. by James A. H. Murray. Part VIII, Sect. 1. Crouchmas-Czech. Completing vol. II (C). 4to. *Clarendon Press*. 4s.

Payne (De V. Payen). French Idioms and Proverbs. Cr. 8vo, vi + 162 pp. *D. Nutt*. 2s. 6d.

Sacred Books of the East. Ed. by F. Max Müller. Vol. 41 (Satapatha-Brahmani, Part 3). 8vo, 444 pp. *Clarendon Press*. 12s. 6d.

St. John (R. F. St. A.) A Burmese Reader. (Oxford Oriental Series.) 8vo. *Clarendon Press*. 10s.

Salisbury (Jesse). A Glossary of Words and Phrases used in S. E. Worcestershire. 8vo, sd., xii + 92 pp. *J. Salisbury*. 4s. 6d.

Standard Dictionary (A) of the English Language. Prepared under the supervision of I. K. Funk, F. A. March and D. S. Gregory. Vol. I. 4to, xx + 1059 pp. *Funk & Wagnalls Co.* 48s.

Tertulliani de Praescriptione Haereticorum—ad Martyres—ad Scapulam. Ed. with introd. and notes by T. H. Bindley. Cr. 8vo. *Clarendon Press.* 6s.

Thucydides. Book 7. Ed. by E. C. Marchant. 12mo, 326 pp. *Macmillan.* 3s. 6d.

— History. Book 8. Ed. with notes and introd. by H. C. Goodhart. 8vo, 220 pp. *Macmillan.* 9s.

## FRENCH.

Adam (Lucien). Matériaux pour servir à l'établissement d'une grammaire comparée des dialectes de la famille Caribée. Gr. in-8. *Maisonneuve.* 10 fr.

## GERMAN.

Aly (Frdr.) Geschichte der römischen Litteratur. (In 7 Lfgn.) 1. Lfg. gr. 8. S. 1-64. B., *R. Gaertner.* m. 1.

Benfey (Thdr.) Gesammelte kleinere Schriften. Ausgewählt u. hrsg. v. Adb. Bezzenberger. 4 Abtlgn. 2. (Titel-)Ausg. gr. 8. B., *Reuther & Reichard*, 1890, '92. m. 29.—1. Kleinere sanskritphilologische Schriften. iii, 342 S. m. 11. 2. Kleinere sprachwissenschaftliche Schriften. 200 S. m. 8. 3. Kleinere Schriften zur Märchenforschung. 237 S. m. 6. 4. Kleinere Schriften vermischten Inhalts. 104 S. m. 4.

Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Poesie, begründet v. Chrn. W. M. Grein. Neu bearb., verm. u. nach neuen Lesgn. der Handschriften hrsg. v. Rich. Paul Wülker. 2. Bd. 2. Hälfte. gr. 8. L., *G. H. Wigand*.—2. Die Verceller Handschrift, die Handschrift des Cambridger Corpus Christi Colles CCI, die Gedichte der sogen. Caedmonhandschrift, Judith, der Hymnus Caedmons, Heiligenkalender, nebst kleineren geistlichen Dichtungen. 2. Hälfte. ix u. S. 211-570. m. 18.

Brandstetter (R.) Malaio-polynes. Forschgn. II. Die Beziehgn. d. Malagasy z. Malaiischen. Stuttgart, *Kohlhammer.* m. 1.50.

Catalogus dissertationum philologicarum classicarum. Verzeichniss v. etwa 18,300 Abhandlgn., zusammengestellt v. Gust. Fock in Leipzig. gr. 8. iv, 222; 148, 72 u. 124 S. L., *G. Fock.* m. 2.50.

Commentarii notarum tironianarum cum prolegomenis adnotationibus criticis et exegeticis notarumque indice alphabetico ed. Wilh. Schmitz. Fol. 117 S. m. 132 Taf. L., *B. G. Teubner.* Text kart., in Mappe m. 40.

Corpus glossariorum latinorum a Gustavo Loewe inchoatum, composuit, recensuit, ed. Geo. Goetz. Vol. V. gr. 8. L., *B. G. Teubner*.—V. Placidus, liber glossarum glossaria reliqua ed. Geo. Goetz. xxxvi, 664 S. m. 22.

Cybulski (Steph.) Tabulae quibus antiquitates graecae et romanae illustrantur. Series I. Tab. VIII. Farbendr. St. Petersburg. L., *K. F. Koehler's Barsort. in Komm.* bar m. 4; Aufzug auf Karton u. lackiert, m. 1.20; auf Leinw. u. lackiert, m. 1.—VIII. Castra romana. 75 X 56.5 cm. Mit erläut. deutschem u. französ. Text. à 7 S. m. 4.

Decurtins (C.) Rätoromanische Chrestomathie. 1. Bd. Surselvisch, Subselvisch, Sursettisch. 2. Lfg. Das XVIII. Jahrh. gr. 8. xx u. S. 209-452. Erlangen, *F. Junge*. m. 9.

Duret (V.) Grammaire savoyarde, publiée par E. Koschwitz, avec une biographie de l'auteur par E. Ritter. Stuttgart, *Kohlhammer*. m. 2.80.

Eckart (Rud.) Niederdeutsche Sprichwörter u. volkstümliche Redensarten. gr. 8. ix S. u. 586 Sp. Braunschweig, *Appelhaus & Pfenningstorff*. m. 8.

Erhardt (Louis). Die Entstehung der homerischen Gedichte. gr. 8. cxiii, 546 S. L., *Duncker & Humblot*. m. 12.

Forchhammer (P. W.) Homer. Seine Sprache. Die Kampfplätze seiner Heroen u. Götter in der Troas. Ein letztes Wort zur Erklärung der Ilias. gr. 4. 42 S. Kiel, *Lipsius & Tischer*. m. 3.

Friedrich (Thom.) Kabiren u. Keilinschriften. gr. 8. iii, 94 S. L., *E. Pfeiffer*. m. 8.

Geiger (Wilh.) Etymologie u. Lautlehre des Afghänischen. [Aus "Abhandlgn. d. k. b. Akad. d. Wiss."] gr. 4. 56 S. München, *G. Franz' Verl. in Komm.* m. 1.70.

Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft in systematischer Darstellung m. besond. Rücksicht auf Geschichte u. Methodik der einzelnen Disziplinen. Hrsg. von Iwan v. Müller. 5. Bd. 1. Abtlg. 6. Bd. 1. Abtlg. gr. 8. München, *C. H. Beck*.—V 1. Geschichte der alten Philosophie v. W. Windelband. Nebst e. Anh.: Abriss der Geschichte der Mathematik u. der Naturwissenschaften im Altertum v. Siegm. Günther. 2. Aufl. viii, 313 S. m. 5.50; geb., m. 7.20. VI 1. Klassische Kunstarchäologie v. Prof. Dr. Sittl. 1. Tl. S. 1-304. m. 5.50.

Heinzel (Rich.) Ueb. Wolframs v. Eschenbach Parzival. [Aus "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8. 114 S. Wien, *F. Tempsky in Komm.* m. 2.30.

Herondas. Mimiamben. Deutsch m. Einleitg. u. Anmerkgn. v. Otto Crusius. 8. xlv, 86 S. Göttingen, *Dieterich's Verl.* m. 2.

Hirschfeld (Leo). Sa'd B. Mansûr Ibn Kammûnah u. seine polemische Schrift. gr. 8. 55 S. B., *E. Felber*. m. 2.50.

Hueffner (Frdr.) De Plauti comoediarum exemplis atticis quaestiones maxime chronologicae. Diss. gr. 8. 79 S. Göttingen, *Dieterich's Verl.* m. 1.50.

Jackson (A. V. W.) Avesta Reader. I. Series. Easier texts, notes and vocabulary. Stuttgart, *Kohlhammer*. m. 4.

Kalopothakes (Demetrius). De Thracia provincia romana. Diss. gr. 8. 80 S. L. B., *R. Heinrich*. m. 2.

Kluge (Frdr.) Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache. 5. Aufl. gr. 8. xxvi, 491 S. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner Verl.* m. 10; geb., m. 12.

Knudtzon (J. A.) Assyrische Gebete an den Sonnengott f. Staat u. königliches Haus aus der Zeit Asarhaddons u. Asurbanipals. 2 Bde. L., *E. Pfeiffer*. m. 40.—1. Autographierte Texte. Fol. iii, 60 S. 2. Einleitung, Umschrift u. Erklärung, Verzeichnisse. Lex.-8. xi, 339 S.

Kretschmer (Paul). Die griechischen Vaseninschriften, ihrer Sprache nach untersucht. gr. 8. viii, 251 S. Gütersloh, *C. Bertelsmann*. m. 5.50.

Krüger (K. W.) Griechische Sprachlehre f. Schulen. 2. Tl. Ueber die Dialekte. 2. Hft. Poetisch-dialekt. Syntax. 4. Aufl., m. Nachweisg. der gewählten Beispiele, besorgt v. W. Pökel. gr. 8. 202 S. Würzburg, *K. W. Krüger*. m. 3.

Krumbacher (Karl). Mittellgriechische Sprichwörter. [Aus "Sitzungsber. d. k. b. Akad. d. Wiss."] gr. 8. vii, 272 S. München, *G. Franz's Verl. in Komm.* m. 3.

Kubitschek (J. W.) u. Frankfurter (S.) Führer durch Carnuntum. Mit Plänen, Illustr. u. 1 Karte. 3. Aufl. 8. 112 S. Wien, *R. Lechner's Sort.* Geb. in Leinw., m. 3; geb. ohne Karte, m. 2.40.

Kulturbilder aus dem klassischen Altertume. VI. (Schluss.) 8. L., *A. Seemann*. geb., à m. 3.

Lederer (Ph.) Hebräische u. chaldäische Abbreviaturen. gr. 8. 48 S. Frankfurt a. M., *J. Kauffmann in Komm.* m. 1.

Luetke (Carl). Pherecydea. Diss. gr. 8. 64 S. Göttingen, *Dieterich's Verl.* m. 1.20.

Manitius (M.) Analekten zur Geschichte des Horaz im Mittelalter (bis 1300). gr. 8. xv, 127 S. Göttingen, *Dieterich's Verl.* m. 2.80.

Meyer-Lübke (Wilh.) Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen. 2. Bd. Formenlehre. 1. Abtlg. gr. 8. 400 S. L., *O. R. Reisland*. m. 11.

Moldenke (Alfr. B.) Cuneiform Texts in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, edited and translated by A. B. M. gr. 8. xx, 136 S. New York. Halle, *J. M. Reichardt*. m. 6.

Monumenta Germaniae selecta ab a. 768 usque ad a. 1250. Ed. M. Doeberl. 5. Bdchn. gr. 8. München, *J. Lindauer*.—5. Zeit Heinrichs VI, Philipps v. Schwaben, Ottos IV u. Friedrichs II. iv, 160 S. m. 3.

Oechelhaeuser (Wilh.) Shakespeareana. gr. 8. v, 251 S. B., *J. Springer*. Geb. in Leinw., m. 6.

Oppert (Gust.) On the Original Inhabitants of Bharatavarsha or India. gr. 8. xv, 711 S. Westminster. L., *O. Harrassowitz*. geb., m. 20; on large paper, m. 40.

Poppelreuter (Jos.) De comoediae atticae primordiis particulae duae. Diss. gr. 8. 45 S. B., *R. Heinrich*. m. 1.20.

Porta linguarum orientalium, inchoavit J. H. Petermann, continuavit Herm. L. Strack. Pars I et XV. 8. B., *Reuther & Reichardt*.—I. Hebräische Grammatik m. Uebungsbuch v. H. L. Strack. 5. Aufl. xvi, 152 u. 104 S. Geb. in Leinw., m. 4. XV. Aegyptische Grammatik m. Schrifttafel, Litteratur, Lesestücken u. Wörterverzeichnis v. Adf. Erman. xv, 200 u. 70 S. m. 16; geb. in Leinw., m. 16.80.

Poznański (Sam.) Beiträge zur Geschichte der hebr. Sprachwissenschaft. I. gr. 8. B., *S. Calvary & Co.*—I. Eine hebräische Grammatik aus dem XIII. Jh. Zum 1. Male hrsg., m. Einleitgn. u. Anmerkgn. versehen. 35 u. 23 S. m. 2.20.

Quellen u. Forschungen zur Sprach- u. Culturgeschichte der germanischen Völker. Hrsg. v. Alois Brandl, Ernst Martin, Erich Schmidt.

72. Hft. gr. 8. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner Verl.*—72. Der althochdeutsche Isidor. Facsimile-Ausg. des Pariser Codex, nebst crit. Texte der Pariser u. Monseer Bruchstücke. Mit Einleitg., grammat. Darstellg. u. e. ausführh. Glossar hrsg. v. George A. Hench. xix, 194 S. m. 22 Taf. m. 20.

Rohde (Erwin). *Psyche. Seelencult u. Unsterblichkeitsglaube der Griechen.* 2. Hälfte. gr. 8. vii u. S. 289-711. Freiburg i. B., *J. C. B. Mohr.* m. 11; kplt., m. 18.

Sachs (Karl). *Französisch-deutsches Supplement-Lexikon.* Unter Mitwirkg. v. Césaire Villatte bearb. Lex.-8. xvi, xvi, 329 S. B., *Langenscheidt.* m. 10; geb., m. 11.50.

Scherrans (W.) *De poetarum comicorum atticorum studiis Homericis.* Diss. gr. 8. 57 S. Königsberg, *W. Koch.* m. 1.

Schleicher (A. W.) *Geschichte der Galla. Bericht e. abbessin. Mönches üb. die Invasion der Galla im 16. Jahrh. Text u. Uebersetzg.,* hrsg. v. A. W. Sch. gr. 8. iv, 42 S. B., *Th. Fröhlich.* m. 2.50.

*Schriften zur germanischen Philologie.* Hrsg. v. Max Roediger. 7. Hft. gr. 8. B., *Weidmann.*—7. Ueber germanischen Versbau. Von Andr. Heusler. viii, 139 S. m. 6.

Schwally (Frdr.) *Idioticon des christlich palästinischen Aramaeisch.* gr. 8. xii, 134 S. Giessen, *J. Ricker.* m. 6.40.

Schweinfurth (G.) *Abyssinische Pflanzennamen.* [Aus "Abhandlgn. d. k. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Berlin."] gr. 4. 84 S. Berlin, *G. Reimer in Komm.* m. 6.

Stbawaihi's Buch üb. die Grammatik. Uebers. u. erklärt v. G. Jahn. (In ca. 14 Lfgn.) 1. Lfg. Lex.-8. 32 u. 65 S. B., *Reuther & Reichard.* m. 4.

Strassmaier (J. N.) *Babylonische Texte.* 11. Hft. gr. 8. L., *E. Pfeiffer.*—11. Inschriften v. Darius, König v. Babylon [521-485 v. Chr.], v. den Thontafeln des Brit. Museums copirt u. autogr. 2. Hft. Nr. 249-451 vom 9. bis 17. Regierungsjahre. S. 161-320. m. 12.

*Studien zum germanischen Alliterationsvers.* Hrsg. v. Max Kaluza. 1. Hft. gr. 8. B., *E. Felber.*—1. Der altenglische Vers. Eine metr. Untersuchg. v. Max Kaluza. 1. Thl. Kritik der bisher. Theorien. xi, 96 S. m. 2.40.

Tomaschek (Wilh.) *Die alten Thraker. Eine ethnolog. Untersuchg.* II. Die Sprachreste. 1. Hälfte. Glossen aller Art u. Götternamen. [Aus "Sitzungsberichte d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8. 70 S. Wien, *F. Tempsky in Komm.* m. 1.40.

Voigt (Geo.) *Die Wiederbelebung des classischen Alterthums od. das 1. Jahrhundert des Humanismus.* (In 2 Bdn.) 2. Bd. 3. Aufl., bes. v. Max Lehnerdt. gr. 8. viii, 543 S. B., *G. Reimer.* à m. 10.

Westerwick (Osc.) *De Plutarchi studiis Hesiodeis.* Diss. gr. 8. 77 S. Münster. Minden, *Körber & Freytag.* m. 1.20.

Willrich (Hugo). *De coniurationis Catilinae fontibus.* Diss. gr. 8. 53 S. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.* m. 1.

Winckler (Hugo). *E. Beitrag zur Geschichte der Assyriologie in Deutschland.* gr. 8. 44 S. L., *E. Pfeiffer.* m. 1.50.

Winckler (Hugo). Sammlung v. Keilschrifttexten. II. Texte verschiedenen Inhalts. 2. Lfg. gr. 4. iv u. S. 41-76. L., *E. Pfeiffer*. m. 8.

Wirth (Albr.) Aus orientalischen Chroniken. gr. 4. iii, lxvi, 276 S. Frankfurt a. M., *M. Diesterweg in Komm.* m. 12.

Xenophon's Anabasis u. Hellenika in Auswahl. Text u. Kommentar. Hrsg. v. Frdr. Gust. Sorof. 2. Bdchn. Anabasis, Buch V-VII, u. Hellenika. gr. 8. iv, 330 S. L., *B. G. Teubner*. m. 2; kart., m. 2.20.

— dasselbe. Kommentar. gr. 8. 182 S. Ebd. m. 1.40; kart., m. 1.60.

Zeidler (Vict.) Die Quellen von Rudolfs v. Ems Wilhelm v. Orlens. Eine krit. Studie. gr. 8. iii, 356 S. B., *E. Felber*. m. 8.

Zerweck (N.) Die hebräische Präposition *min*. gr. 8. 60 S. L., *Verlag der Akadem. Buchh. (W. Faber)*. m. 3.

## ITALIAN.

Bortolan (D.) Vocabolario del dialetto antico vicentino (dal sec. XIV a tutto il secolo XVI). Vicenza. 8vo, p. 312. L. 5.

Pindaro. Le odi, dichiarate e tradotte dal Giuseppe Fraccaroli. Verona. 8vo, p. 729. L. 20.

Scerbo (F.) Caratteristiche del greco e del latino. Firenze. 8vo, p. 156. L. 4.

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

Archaeologisch-epigraphische Mittheilungen aus Oesterreich-Ungarn, herausg. von O. Benndorf u. E. Bormann. Jahrg. XVI. Heft 2. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1893.

Aristophanes. The Wasps. With introduction and notes by W. W. Merry. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1893.

ΑΘΗΝΑ. Σύγγραμμα περιοδικόν. Τόμος πέμπτος, τεύχος τέταρτον. Ἀθήνησιν, 1894.

Billerbeck (A.) Susa. Eine Studie zur alten Geschichte Westasiens. Mit e. Uebersichtskarte u. 10 Abbildungen. Eingef. von Fr. Delitzsch. Leipzig, *J. H. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung*, 1893. 5 m. 50 pf.

Board of Trade of Baltimore City. Report for the year ending Sept. 1893. Baltimore, *Fleet, McGinley & Co.*, 1893.

Bureau of Ethnology, The Ninth Annual Report of, 1887-1888, by J. W. Powell, Director. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1892.

Burton (Ernest De Witt). Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek. Second ed., revised and enlarged. Chicago, *University Press of Chicago*, 1893.

Ciceros Rede für den Dichter Archias. Für den Schulgebr. herausg. von Hermann Nohl. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*. 40 pf.

Cicero. Laelius. Ed. by Shuckburgh. New ed., rev. and enlarged for use in American colleges by H. C. Johnson. London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1894. 40 cts.

Climatology and Physical Features of Maryland. First Report of the Maryland State Weather Service for 1892 and 1893.

Columbia Calendar, 1894. Published by Pope Manufacturing Co., 221 Columbus Avenue, Boston.

Cook (A. S.) A First Book in Old English. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1894. \$1.60.

Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum editum consilio et impensis academiae litterarum Caesariae Vindobonensis. Vol. XXVIII (Sec. III, Pars I). S. Aurelii Augustini de genesi ad litteram libri etc. Ex recensione Iosephi Zycha. Vindobonae, *F. Tempsky*. Lipsiae, *G. Freytag*, MDCCCLXXXIV. 16 m. 80 pf.

Crusius (Otto). Die Mimiamben des Herondas. Deutsch, mit Einleitung u. Anmerkungen. Göttingen, *Dieterichsche Verlagsbuchhandlung*, 1893.

Daudet (Alphonse). Morceaux Choisis. Ed. and annotated by F. W. Freeborn. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1894. 80 cts.

Dictionnaire général de la langue française du commencement du XVIIe siècle jusqu'à nos jours, par MM. Hatzfeld, A. Darmesteter et Ant. Thomas. 12e fascicule. Paris, *Delagrave*. Prix de souscription à l'ouvrage complet 30 fr.

Educational Review. Ed. by Nicholas Murray Butler. January, February, March, 1894. New York, *Henry Holt & Co.* \$3 a year.

English Dictionary, Philological Society's, ed. by J. A. H. Murray. Part VIII, Sect. I. CROUCHMAS-CZECH, completing vol. II. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press.* New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1893. \$1.

Grimme (Hubert). Der Strophenbau in den Gedichten Ephraems des Syrsers. Collectanea Friburgensia. Fasc. II. Friburgi Helvetiorum. *ap. Bibliopolam Universitatis*, MDCCCXCIII.

Grundriss der romanischen Philologie, unter Mitwirkung von [zahlreichen Gelehrten] herausg. von Gustav Gröber. II. Band. 2. Abtlg. 2. Lfg. Strassburg, *Karl J. Trübner*, 1894. 2 m.

Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, herausg. von Iwan von Müller. 18ter Halbband enth.: Band VI, Bogen 1-19. (Klassische Kunstarchäologie von Prof. Dr. Sittl.) München, *C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung*, 1893. 5 m. 50 pf.

Hyperides. The Orations against Athenogenes and Philippides. Ed. with a transl. by F. G. Kenyon. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1893. \$1.60.

Imperial University of Japan. The Calendar for 1892-93. Tōkyō, *Z. P. Maruya & Co.*, 1893.

Jackson (A. V. Williams). Avesta Reader. First Series. Stuttgart, *W. Kohlhammer.* Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1893. (Mailing price) \$1.75.

Jebb (R. C.) The Growth and Influence of Classical Greek Poetry. Boston and New York, *Houghton, Mifflin & Co.*, 1893.

Lawton (W. C.) Syllabus of a Course of Six Lectures on the Literary Study of Homer. (University Extension Lectures.) 10 cts.

March (Francis A.) The Spelling Reform. Washington, *The Government Printing Office*, 1893.

Modern Language Association, Publications of the. Ed. by James W. Bright. (Vol. IX, No. 1. N. S.: Vol. II, No. 1.) Contents: Kirby F. Smith, An Historical Study of the Werewolf in Literature; J. D. Bunce, The Anglo-Saxon Version of the Book of Psalms, commonly known as the Paris Psalter. Baltimore, *The Association*, 1894.

Molière. L'Avare. With biography of the author, notes, and complete vocabulary, by Théodore Henckels. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1894. 65 cts.

Müller (F. Max). Three Lectures on the Science of Language. (Religion of Science Library.) Chicago, *Open Court Publishing Co.* 25 cts.

Muss-Arnolt (W.) The Cuneiform Account of the Creation and the Deluge. Revised Translation. (Reprinted from the Biblical World.)

Omero. L'Iliade. Con note italiane del Prof. Ludovico Macinai. Canto 1. Frascati, *Collegio di Mondragone*, 1894. L. 2.50.

Phelps (W. L.) The Beginnings of the English Romantic Movement. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1893. \$1.10.

Pilling (James Constantine). Bibliography of the Algonquian Languages. (Bureau of Ethnology.) 1891.

— Bibliography of the Athapascan Languages. 1892.

— Bibliography of the Chinookan Languages (including the Chinook Jargon). 1893.

— Bibliography of the Eskimo Language. 1887.

Pilling (James Constantine). Bibliography of the Iroquoian Languages. 1888.

— Bibliography of the Muskhoegan Languages. 1889.

— Bibliography of the Salishan Languages. 1893.

— Bibliography of the Siouian Languages. (Bureau of Ethnology.) Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1887.

Prince (John Dyneley). Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin. An historical study of the fifth chapter of Daniel. (J. H. U. Diss.) Baltimore, 1893.

Rand (Silas Tertius). Legends of the Micmacs. (Wellesley Philological Publications.) New York and London, *Longmans, Green & Co.*, 1894.

Ribot (Th.) The Diseases of Personality. (Religion of Science Library.) Chicago, *Open Court Publishing Co.*, 1894. 25 cts.

Riehl (W. H.) Burg Neideck. Novelle. With introd. and notes by C. B. Wilson. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1894. 35 cts.

Scheindler, Wörterverzeichnis zu Homeri Iliadis A-Δ. Nach der Reihenfolge im Verse geordnet. Dritte unveränderte Aufl. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1894. geb., 1 m.

Schmidt (A. M. A.) Schüler-commentar zu T. Livii ab urbe condita libri I, II, XXI, XXII. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1894. 1 m. 60 pf.

Sever (F. P.) The Progressive Speller. *D. C. Heath & Co.*, 1894. 30 cts.

Sittl (Karl). Klassische Kunstarchäologie. See Handbuch.

Sonnenschein (E. A.) A Greek Grammar for Schools. Part I. Accidence. (Parallel Grammar Series.) London, *Swan Sonnenschein & Co.*, 1892.

Strabo. Selections from. With an introduction on Strabo's Life and Works. By H. F. Tozer. With maps and plans. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1893. 12s.

Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature. Vol. II. Publ. under the direction of the Modern Language Departments of Harvard University. *Ginn & Co.*, 1893.

Terence. The Adelphoe of, with introduction, notes and critical appendix by Sidney G. Ashmore. London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1893.

Thucydides. Ausgewählte Abschnitte für den Schulgebr. bearbeitet von Christian Harder. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1894. Erster Teil: Text. geb., 1 m. 50 pf.—Zweiter Teil: Schülercommentar. geb., 40 pf.

— Book VII. Ed. by E. C. Marchant. London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1893.

Vergil's Aeneid, The Eighth Book of. Ed. for the use of schools by John Tetlow. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1893.

White (Emerson E.) School Management. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago, *American Book Co.*, 1894. \$1.

Windelband (W.) Geschichte der alten Philosophie. Zweite sorgfältig durchgesehene Aufl. (mit Register). (Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft. In Verbindung mit zahlreichen Gelehrten herausg. v. Iwan v. Müller. V. Band. 1. Abt.) München, *C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung*, 1893. 5 m. 50 pf.